

THE
LANCASHIRE & YORKSHIRE INSURANCE
COMPANY, LTD.

HEAD OFFICE: 30, BROWN STREET, MANCHESTER.

Established 1877.

Capital, £200,000.

This COMPANY'S GUARANTEE BONDS are accepted by H.M. COURTS OF CHANCERY and BOARD OF TRADE, and by all Departments of H.M. Government.

MORTGAGE and DEBENTURE INSURANCE.

The "CLIMAX" POLICY of the Company provides against ACCIDENTS—ILLNESS—PERMANENT DISABLEMENT, &c. Capital Sums Assured under the Policy are added to annually under a CUMULATIVE BONUS SCHEME.

Policies are also issued indemnifying Employers in relation to the Workmen's Compensation Acts, 1897-1900, the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, and at Common Law, and Public Liability (Third Party) Risks.

R. KENNEDY MITCHELL, Manager and Secretary.

LAW REVERSIONARY INTEREST
SOCIETY, LIMITED.

THANET HOUSE, 231-232, STRAND LONDON, W.C.

(OPPOSITE THE LAW COURTS).

REMOVED FROM NO. 24, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1853.

Capital Stock ... £400,000

Debenture Stock ... £278,130

REVERSIONS BOUGHT. LOANS MADE THEREON.

Proposal Forms and full information may be had at the Society's Office.

W. OSCAR NASH, F.I.A., Actuary and Secretary.

IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENSED PROPERTY

To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of
LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages on Licensed Properties Guaranteed promptly.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

AND
SECURE.

FUNDS - - - £4,700,000. INCOME - - - £610,000.
YEARLY BUSINESS - - £2,594,000. BUSINESS IN FORCE - £18,000,000.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. The Earl of HALSBURY.
The Hon. Mr. Justice KIRKWHIT.
His Honour Judge BACON.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.
RICHARD PENNINGTON, Esq., J.P.

DIRECTORS.

Bacon, His Honour Judge.
Davies, The Right Hon. Lord.
Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
Ellis-Davies, Edmund Henry, Esq.
Fitch, Arthur J., Esq.
Frost, Geo. Edgar, Esq.
Hawley, C. E. H. Chadwick, Esq., C.B.,
K.C.
Johnson, Charles P., Esq.
Kirkwhit, The Hon. Mr. Justice.
Masterman, Henry Chauncy, Esq.

Mathew, The Right Hon. Sir J. C.
Meek, A. Grant, Esq., J.P. (Deceased).
Mellor, The Right Hon. John W., K.C.
Morrell, Frederic P., Esq. (Oxford).
Pennington, Richard, Esq., J.P.
Rawle, Thomas, Esq.
Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.
Tweedie, R. W., Esq.
Williams, Homer, Esq., J.F., D.L.
Williams, William, Esq.

VOL. L., No. 51.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, OCTOBER 20, 1906.

* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication in the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	795	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	803
PART PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT OF COSTS 798		THE LAND REGISTRY	803
EXECUTOR'S RIGHT TO APPOINTED		LEGAL EDUCATION	806
LAND	800	LEGAL NEWS	806
REVIEWS	801	COURT PAPERS	807
CORRESPONDENCE	801	WINDING-UP NOTICES	807
POINTS TO BE NOTED	801	CREDITORS' NOTICES	807
LAW SOCIETIES	802	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	809

Case Reported this Week.

J. H. Selkirk (Lim.) (Petition of Associated Newspapers (Lim.)), Re... 802

Current Topics.

The New County Court Judge.

MR. CYRIL DODD, K.C., has been appointed Judge of the County Court Circuit 16, in the place of Judge RAIKES, deceased. Mr. DODD was educated at Merton College, Oxford, was called to the bar in 1869, and has practised on the North-Eastern Circuit. He has been one of the editors of Bullen and Leake's Precedents of Pleadings. Like the last appointee to a County Court Judgeship, he formerly sat in the House of Commons on the Liberal side.

The Vacation Court.

THE LIST of cases to be dealt with by Mr. Justice BARGRAVE DRAKE in the last court of the Vacation on Wednesday, the 17th of October last, was the lightest, with the exception of one, since the 12th of August; twenty-two matters only being set down for decision. Most of these went over by consent until motion days in term. Somewhat to the inconvenience of those having business, whether as counsel or solicitors—but especially of the latter—the court was held in Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Court I., instead of in the Lord Chief Justice's Court as hitherto, and probably the learned judge was the only one who felt quite at home there.

The Land Registry Report.

THE REPORT of the Registrar of the Land Registry, which has just been issued, contains statistics as to the work of the registry for the years 1902 to 1905, but its more important feature is the intimation it gives of the legislative extensions of the system of registration of title at which the officials aim. With compulsory registration in force throughout the County of London it is no surprise to find that the work of the office has been very considerable. The first registrations of freehold titles for the four years in question, beginning with 1902, were 3,945, 3,800, 3,261, and 3,147 respectively; and of leasehold titles 11,857, 11,283, 10,609, 11,014. These give a total of 58,916 registrations, or an average of forty-eight a day. The decrease in freehold registrations admits—apart from business depression—of the explanation suggested by the registrar. Since the total area of unregistered land in the county is constantly decreasing, the number of sales inducing the initial registration of land has a natural tendency to diminish likewise. There is no special object, however, in emphasizing the extent of the present work of the registry. That must obviously be large. It would have been more to the point had the report contrasted the figures which prevail under compulsion with those which prevailed when landowners were free to register or not

as they chose. The figures now given simply record the number of land sales in the County of London. The suggested comparison would shew the opinion of the utility of the system entertained by those really interested. The statistics are swollen by the number of dealings with registered land after registration, and the registrar takes the opportunity of describing in detail the course of procedure in the office. He gives special prominence to the recently introduced facilities for the registration of titles as absolute at a reduced initial cost, and for the conversion of six years' registered possessory titles into absolute titles. It appears, however, that the number of persons who apply for absolute instead of possessory titles is still—to use the words of the report—"comparatively insignificant," and the official mind has evidently been pained by the lack of cordiality with which the latest phase of registration with absolute title was received by the legal world. It is even darkly hinted that the advertisements of the scheme which were handed to solicitors at the Registry Office, not infrequently—*horribile dictu*—found their way into the ordinary receptacle for advertising circulars, instead of being promptly passed on to the clients. "So in the beginning of 1904, it was decided to send the statements to the registered proprietors themselves, which practice has since been adhered to." An ingenious change, no doubt, but it does not seem to have materially affected the result.

The Extension of Registration of Title.

THE FITH of the Land Registry report is to be found in Part III., which deals with "Suggestions for Further Legislation." The registrar divides his proposals under three heads—(1) Amendments of detail in the system of registration itself; (2) greater facilities for the extension of the system into other parts of the country; and (3) the general registration of absolute instead of possessory titles. The amendment of the existing system raises technical questions, of which Mr. BRICKDALE does not attempt any minute investigation, but he clearly feels the pressure of *Capital and Counties Bank v. Rhodes* (51 W. R. 470; 1903, 1 Ch. 631) and of the defects of registered charges in regard to the possession of the legal estate. The time has come, he thinks, to abolish as to registered land the distinction between legal and equitable estates, or, if it is retained, he would vest the legal estate in the registered proprietor, and would facilitate the registered incumbrancer in acquiring and disposing of it. These are matters which, no doubt, are worthy of consideration if registration of title is to be permanent. Its permanence Mr. BRICKDALE assumes, but the Land Transfer Act, 1897, presents, in his view, very unfortunate obstacles to its extension. The County of London has been captured, but the local option enshrined in section 20 of the Act is for the present a bar to any further application of compulsion, and, even if the bar can be removed here and there, this will fall very far short of the extension of compulsory registration to the whole country. Mr. BRICKDALE desires, therefore, to restore the initiative of extension to the Privy Council—that is, to the Lord Chancellor for the time being—"subject to such right (if any) of local objection as may be deemed necessary or desirable." He briefly touches upon the question whether an inquiry should precede any such change, and professes to be quite agreeable to this "*provided the right issue is raised*." We take it that a reference could without difficulty be framed in terms wide enough to satisfy all parties interested, and if evidence of the present inconvenience incident to registration of title were admitted, Mr. BRICKDALE would, on his side, have an opportunity of expatiating on the millennium which he hopes to attain when absolute registered titles are universal. But even an extension of compulsory registration does not satisfy him. Registration on sale is only a temporary expedient. The official view looks further still. "It would appear to be worth serious consideration whether the whole difficulty of providing the initial cost of establishing the registers might not be overcome by the expedient of raising a Government loan sufficient to pay the expenses, both public and private, of the whole operation of registering all good holding titles as absolute, to be repaid within a limited period out of the surplus fees on future registered dealings." At any rate the registrar is to be congratulated on the bigness of his views. The expenditure of over £200,000 in providing him with a new office has only

served to whet his appetite. Some five millions or so more—though he does not stoop to mention the figure—would enable him to make a new Doomsday Book and to appreciably hasten the millennium of universal registration. Statutes, however, passed as was the Land Transfer Act of 1897 are not so easily set aside, and there is the Treasury to be reckoned with. Meanwhile, the chief result, perhaps, is that there is no official objection to an inquiry. It is merely a matter of settling the terms of reference.

The Rule Against Perpetuities.

IN CONSIDERING whether the exercise of a power of appointment by will is obnoxious to the rule against perpetuities, it is, of course, material to distinguish according as the power is general or special. In each case the interest limited by the appointment must take effect within the period of a life or lives in being or within a further period of twenty-one years, but the date from which the period is to be reckoned will vary according to the nature of the power. If it is a general power, the period dates from the death of the appointor, and the person to take and the amount of his interest must be ascertained within a life then in being or within twenty-one years after the determination of such life. If it is a special power arising under a will, the period dates from the death of the testator, and the vesting must take place within a life in being at such death or within twenty-one years thereafter. But this does not mean that the limitations arising under the power are to be read into the original will and their validity judged accordingly, and an interesting example of the true test to be applied is afforded by the decision of JOYCE, J., in *Re Thompson* (54 W. R. 613; 1906, 2 Ch. 199). There a testator gave his residuary estate to his wife MARY THOMPSON for life, with a testamentary power of appointment among all or any of a class, which included his brother CHARLES THOMPSON and his issue. The testator died in 1872. His wife died in 1893, having by her will made in 1879, as varied by a codicil made in 1891, appointed the testator's estate to CHARLES THOMPSON for life, and then among all the children of CHARLES THOMPSON who being male attained twenty-five years, if born in the lifetime of the appointrix, or twenty-one years, if born after her decease, or being female attained twenty-five years, if born in her lifetime, or twenty-one years, if born after her decease, or who previously married. Here, therefore, were limitations under the special power which, if read as they stood into the original will creating the power, would have been obnoxious to the rule against perpetuities. The life of the appointrix was a life in being at the death of the testator, but the direction for vesting at twenty-five would have carried the limitations beyond the permitted period. But though under such circumstances the first life must be in being at the death of the original testator, yet the vesting of the subsequent interests within twenty-one years will depend upon the state of affairs when the will of the appointrix takes effect. In the present case all the children of CHARLES THOMPSON born in the lifetime of the appointrix had attained twenty-five years at the time of her death. Hence when her will took effect, the gift as regards them created immediate vested interests in their favour. The class was liable, indeed, to be increased by children born after her death, but as to them the vesting was confined to twenty-one years. In view, therefore, of the circumstances existing at the death of the appointrix, the persons to take and the shares to be taken were ascertainable within the life of the appointrix—a life existing at the death of the original testator—or within twenty years after, and there was no infringement of the rule against perpetuities.

Royal Commissions in New South Wales.

THE RECENT report of the Royal Commission on the Administration of the Crown Lands Department in New South Wales affords instructive, and occasionally even amusing, reading. The commission was issued to Mr. Justice OWEN as sole commissioner, and the inquiry held related principally to the conduct of a former Minister for Lands, who was said to have exercised his powers as a Minister of the Crown in an improper manner. The following extract illustrates the case with which the executive and the Legislature can work together in a miniature British constitution. With reference

to the powers conferred by the commission, the commissioner says: "In July [1905] it was made apparent that unless I had further powers my commission must be futile, and accordingly, at the instance of the Government, Parliament passed the Act No. 4 (1905) conferring on me, as commissioner, certain of the powers of a judge of the Supreme Court. In the month of August, in consequence partly of the absence of Mr. WILLIS in South Africa, and partly in consequence of the refusal of Mrs. WILLIS and of Mr. WILLIS's clerks to allow the boxes of Mr. and Mrs. WILLIS at the Sydney Safe Deposit to be examined for the purpose of discovering if any books or papers were therein contained which might assist the commission, it became necessary to extend my powers to enable me to examine these boxes and papers, and the Act No. 11 (1905) was accordingly passed. Subsequently it was deemed necessary to offer an indemnity to every person, examined as a witness, making a full and true disclosure touching all matters in respect of which he was examined, and the Act No. 17 (1905) was passed." Three special Acts of Parliament in a few months in aid of a royal commissioner! This might well be called government by *deus ex machina* or special Act of Parliament! If the Land Registry succeed in the schemes set forth in the Registrar's recent report, we shall have something like a counterpart of this procedure in England. In the case of another Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into the formation of an industrial union, a person summoned as a witness refused to give evidence on the ground that the commission was unlawful. This person was charged before a magistrate with having so refused (this being an offence in New South Wales), and it required the decision of the High Court of Australia to establish the validity of the royal commission: see *Clough v. Leahy* (2 Commonw. L. R. 139).

The Juvenile Smoking Bill.

THE SELECT Committee appointed to consider the Juvenile Smoking Bill [House of Lords] and to consider the question of juvenile smoking generally and its effect on the physical condition of children, have presented their report. They consider that there is conclusive proof that juvenile smoking has increased rapidly during the last few years, and that it has had a bad effect upon the general health and physique of the present generation, whilst it must have even a worse effect upon the future generations. Two Bills have been under their consideration, one introduced by Lord REAY and referred to the committee, and the other settled by Sir RALPH LITTLER, K.C., Chairman of the Middlesex Quarter Sessions. The committee recommend that legislation should proceed rather on the lines of the Bill settled by Sir RALPH LITTLER. This Bill enacts, first, that every person who knowingly sells or delivers, or permits or suffers to be sold or delivered, any description of cigarettes to any child under the age of sixteen years shall be liable to a penalty of not exceeding 40s. for the first offence and £5 for any subsequent offence, and that every child under the age of sixteen who shall be found in possession of cigarettes, or found smoking tobacco in any form, shall upon conviction be liable to a penalty not exceeding 40s. for each offence, and shall be subject to the provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901. The committee recommend that, in addition, police constables should be empowered to stop all youths apparently under sixteen seen smoking in any public place, and that they should be allowed to confiscate any tobacco found upon them, and that a similar power should be extended by bye-laws to park keepers and others. The provisions of the Youthful Offenders Act enable the parent to be made liable for the fine which is imposed upon the child. We think that the power given to a constable who sees a boy smoking, to take his cigarette away and confiscate any tobacco found upon him, is a useful one, and we can only hope that the proposed legislation may be effective. The duties which it casts upon the police are, we are afraid, not likely to increase their popularity.

Fairs and Markets.

THE CASE of *Gingell, Son, & Fuskett v. Stepney Borough Council* (1906, 2 K. B. 468) is one of the few cases in which a dispute has arisen at the present day as to the limits of an ancient market. The principal question was whether a hay market,

granted to the lord of the manor of Stepney, was limited to High-street, Whitechapel, or extended to any adjoining streets. The learned judge (SWINFEN EADY, J.), after a consideration of certain local Acts of Parliament and documents and the evidence of user, came to the conclusion that the Whitechapel Market was a market without metes and bounds, and might extend from time to time as the exigencies of the market might require, and that the streets adjoining High-street, Whitechapel, must be presumed to have been dedicated to the public subject to the exercise of the market franchise. Actions for the disturbance of fairs and markets are common enough in the older reports, but we are disposed to think that many legal practitioners would be unable to give an accurate account of the nature of the franchise which is conferred by the grant from the Crown of a fair or market. A market has been defined as the franchise right of having a concourse of buyers and sellers to dispose of commodities in respect of which the franchise is given. The chief distinction between a market and a fair seems to be that fairs are larger than markets and are held only on a few stated days in the year, whereas markets are held once a week or oftener. Amusements and sports were provided at the great annual or quarterly fairs, but these were merely incidental to the business of the fair. Formerly all markets were holden in the public streets, and a claim by immemorial custom to exclude persons from selling marketable commodities in their private shops within the limits of the franchise on market days was valid in law. But as the communication between different parts of the country became more easy, the commercial importance of fairs and markets declined. WILLIAM COBBETT, in his *Rural Rides*, written in 1825, says that shops have devoured markets and fairs. He goes on to protest against the increase of shops and the introduction of middlemen, saying that fairs and markets brought the producer and the consumer together and enabled wares and commodities to be sold at a more reasonable price. We do not know whether these opinions had the approval of many of Mr. COBBETT's contemporaries. They can only be read with amusement at the present day.

Incapacity of Barrister to Maintain Action for Fees.

THE PRESIDENT of the Law Society referred, in the course of his address at the provincial meeting last week, to the custom by which the advocate of the bar is incapable of contracting to render his service for hire. This position of the barrister, said the President, had not been always unassailed, and even now he greatly regretted that men of business in London seemed disposed to assail it, and that questions had been asked in the House of Commons of the Attorney-General whether the position of the barrister should not be made one of simple contract between advocate and client. The President was decidedly of opinion that the custom ought not to be shaken or varied, and quoted a passage in the judgment of ERLE, C.J., in *Kennedy v. Brown* (13 C. B. N. S. 677), in which the learned Chief Justice, after stating that the incapacity of the advocate in litigation to make a contract of hiring affects the integrity and dignity of advocates, proceeds, in effect, to say that the mind of the advocate is elevated, and his sense of duty strengthened, by the fact that he is unable to make a contract of hiring, and by the fact that his only remuneration is in the form of a gratuity. We have always thought that an enactment enabling a barrister to recover his fees in a court of justice is inexpedient, for we deprecate any sudden and violent change in the traditions of the profession. But we are none the less convinced that a change in these traditions is slowly working its way. Day by day the advocate makes *de facto* a contract with the solicitor who retains him, which is just as binding as any other honourable understanding between gentlemen which is without the essentials of a formal agreement. We have often read the judgment of ERLE, C.J., in *Kennedy v. Brown*, and while we fully appreciate the learning, dignity, and eloquence of the eminent judge, we are unable to follow part of the reasoning by which his conclusions are supported.

Forensic Elocution.

IN AN article in *Macmillan's Magazine* on "Forensic Elocution," the writer observes that in courts of law eloquence has gradually

lapsed into plain colloquy; that this change is not wholly unsuited to the practical spirit of the age, but that there is still a welcoming ear for clear, intelligible diction and the light and shade of emphasis. Yet the pleaders are very few who can narrate simple facts in interesting fashion; still fewer are those whose speeches reveal a cultured choice of language. The writer adds that a splendid opportunity lies at the hand of every lawyer for picturesque narration, but very few attempt to seize it, and he quotes a saying of MATHEW, L.J., "The arguments most often repeated are the worst; the good ones take care of themselves."

We are far from thinking that the ordinary speeches of counsel are not occasionally deficient in clearness and in the proper choice of language. But there is, after all, something to be said on their behalf. A concise, lucid, and expressive discourse may be fully appreciated by a tired jury of no more than the average intelligence, but the experienced advocate is warned by his experience that he had better guard against inattentions by telling his story over and over again. If, on the other hand, he is called upon to address a judge sitting without a jury, he is fortunate indeed if his lordship does not interrupt him with questions, breaking his carefully arranged speech into fragments, and finally driving him to think that he can only convey his meaning by detached sentences. Any one who has had the experience of addressing a bench consisting of several judges, and of being questioned by more than one of them at the same time, will be impatient of the criticism on the elegance and precision of the language in which his replies are worded.

Purchasers of Pirated Music.

IN A CASE before a court of summary jurisdiction at Willesden, where the defendant was charged under the Musical Copyright Act, 1906, with selling pirated copies of a musical work, the magistrate is reported to have inquired as to the purchaser. He was told that the Act gave the police no power to take proceedings against purchasers of pirated music, and he thereupon remanded the defendant on his own recognizances, saying that he did not consider that a man ought to be arrested for selling what is practically stolen property and that no notice should be taken of the receiver, who was generally the worst offender. The magistrate is reported to have added that he would confer with his colleagues on the subject. We cannot doubt that the result of such a conference would induce the magistrate to alter his opinion. An infringement of copyright is not larceny, but a statutory offence, and if the statute makes no provision for criminal proceedings against the purchaser of pirated works, no such proceedings can be taken. We think, too, that the distinction drawn by the Legislature between the vendor and the purchaser is founded on good sense and justice. Many of those who buy pirated music in the street are probably ignorant of the law, but the seller generally knows well that his trade is unlawful. We have heard buyers of mushrooms and blackberries in a country town express surprise at their cheapness, and suggest that the seller obtained them by some deliberate trespass. Would the magistrate consider that these persons should be punished as the receivers of stolen goods?

Proof of Age.

IN A CASE which recently came before one of the revising barristers it was objected that a young man who claimed to be on the list of voters was not of the age of twenty-one years. The claimant proposed to give evidence as to his own age, but the barrister rejected his evidence and struck his name off the list of voters, saying that no one could be admitted to speak as to his own age. Strictly speaking, a man cannot know his own age except from hearsay information, for he is not capable of knowing anything till an appreciable time after his birth. But a certificate of birth is received as *prima facie* evidence of age, and this certificate is hearsay, and no more likely to be accurate than the sworn statement of the party concerned, based as it must be on family tradition and fortified by the deponent's knowledge of himself.

The following dates have been fixed by the Lord Chief Justice for the autumn sittings on the North-Eastern Circuit: Newcastle, Monday, November 19; Durham, Friday, November 23; York, Friday, November 30; Leeds, Wednesday, December 5.

Part Payment on Account of Costs.

THE decision of KEKEWICH, J., in *Re Boswell* (54 W. R. 306; 1906, 2 Ch. 359) is a useful illustration of the principles which are applicable in considering whether a solicitor's claim against his client is kept alive by payments made on account of costs. A solicitor's claim for costs is of course subject to the usual limitation of six years from the time when his cause of action accrues, though in practice this is abbreviated by the requirement of section 37 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, that he cannot commence an action until the expiration of one month from the delivery of his bill. This does not postpone the cause of action, and the statute runs from the completion of the work in respect of which the costs are due, and not from the end of one month after delivery of the bill: *Coburn v. Colledge* (45 W. R. 488; 1897, 1 Q. B. 702). With respect to an ordinary action a solicitor has no right to sue for his costs until the action is finally terminated: *Harris v. Osbourn* (2 C. & M. 629), *Whitehead v. Lord* (1852, 7 Ex. 691). His contract is to carry on the proceedings until the end, and he cannot determine it without reasonable cause and without giving reasonable notice: *Underwood v. Lewis* (42 W. R. 517; 1894, 2 Q. B. 306). Hence earlier items in the bill of costs are not excluded because they are more than six years old, if the action terminated within six years: *Martindale v. Falkner* (2 C. B. 706). The right to costs does not arise till the action is terminated by judgment (*Rothery v. Munnings*, 1 B. & Ad. 15), and if there is an appeal, this is a continuation of the action, and prevents the statute from running: *Harris v. Quinn* (L. R. 4 Q. B. 653). But this rule does not apply to equity matters, where the obtaining of the judgment is only one stage in the cause, and the working out of the judgment requires further steps to be taken; nor to proceedings in bankruptcy and winding up (*Re Hall & Barker*, 26 W. R. 501, 9 Ch. D. 538), or to arbitrations (*Re Romer and Haslam*, 42 W. R. 51; 1893, 2 Q. B. 286), where the course of the proceedings is such as to admit of natural breaks, and the solicitor is then entitled to treat each part as a separate transaction.

When the cause of action in respect of costs has once accrued, there is no statutory provision which enables the solicitor to protect himself against the lapse of time by either acknowledgment or part payment. To gain any such advantage he must rely upon the principle established by *Tanner v. Smart* (6 B. & C. 603), that an acknowledgment is evidence of a new promise to pay the debt, and as such constitutes a new cause of action. "There must be," said MELLISH, L.J., in *Mitchell's Claim* (6 Ch., p. 828), "one of these three things to take the case out of the statute: either there must be an acknowledgment of the debt from which a promise to pay is to be implied; or, secondly, there must be an unconditional promise to pay the debt; or, thirdly, there must be a conditional promise to pay the debt and evidence that the condition has been performed." And a payment on account of a debt operates, like an acknowledgment, as evidence of a new promise. Consequently for a part payment of a debt or a payment of interest to exclude the statute, the payment must be made under such circumstances that a promise to pay the balance of the debt, or the whole debt, as the case may be, can be implied. "It must," said PARKE, B., in *Foster v. Dasher* (6 Ex., p. 853), "be a payment of a portion of the debt, accompanied by an acknowledgment, from which a promise may be inferred to pay the remainder." And TURNER, V.C., in *Fordham v. Wallis* (10 Hare, p. 225), says: "The bar of the statute is precluded by payment of interest because the payment of interest is an acknowledgment of the debt, and the law implies from the acknowledgment of the debt a promise to pay it."

Since a payment, in order to exclude the statute, must be such as to imply a promise to pay the remainder of the debt, it must be shown that it was made as part payment of a greater debt, and that such debt is the one for which the action is brought. "Unless it amounts to an admission that more is due, it cannot operate as an admission of any still existing debt": per PARKE, B., in *Tippett v. Heane* (1 C. M. & R. 252). Hence where there is more than one debt, the plaintiff must prove that the payment on which he relies as excluding the statute is applicable to the debt sued for: *Burkitt v. Blanchard* (3 Ex. 89). And in

this respect it is important to notice that to raise an implied promise to pay a particular debt the payment must be appropriated to that debt by the debtor. If the debtor does not appropriate at the time of payment, the right to appropriate devolves upon the creditor, and can be exercised by him at any time (*The Mecca*, 1897, A. C. 286), and the creditor can apply any particular payment to a statute-barred debt, though such an appropriation will not revive the debt, since it implies no promise on the part of the debtor: *Nash v. Hodgson* (6 D. M. & G. 474, p. 490). If there has been no appropriation by the debtor, and all except one of the debts are statute-barred, the payment will be attributed exclusively to the debt that is not barred, and as to that the statute will be excluded: *Nash v. Hodgson*; and where the defendant has throughout denied one debt the payment may be attributed to the other: *Burn v. Boulton* (2 C. B. 476). Where no such ground of distinction exists, and no express appropriation has been made by the debtor, it will be a question whether either debt is taken out of the statute (*Burn v. Boulton*), though in general the payment would be evidence to go to the jury that it was made on account of both debts: *Walker v. Butler* (6 E. & B. 506).

Since the statute bars the debt without extinguishing it, a statute-barred debt may be revived by a part payment which can be shewn to be made on account of it. But it follows from the authorities already cited that where, at the time of payment, there are various sums due, some of which are more than six years old, these earlier items will not be taken out of the statute unless the payment can be shewn to have been made with reference to them, as where the items are connected so as to form one account, and the payment is clearly made in respect of the entire balance due (*Walker v. Butler*, *supra*), or where a payment made on a statement of accounts which includes the earlier items is larger than the balance due in respect of the items within six years: *Re Friend* (1897, 2 Ch. 421). By section 1 of the Statute of Frauds Amendment Act, 1828, an acknowledgment is required to be in writing, but there is a proviso that "nothing herein contained shall alter or take away or lessen the effect of any payment of any principal or interest made by any person whatsoever." And such payment need not be actually made in money. Any facts which would be sufficient to establish a plea of payment in an action brought to recover money will be sufficient: *per MARTIN, B.*, in *Maber v. Maber* (L. R. 2 Ex. 153). In that case the debtor was on the point of making a payment of interest. The creditor stopped him, and handed the debtor's wife a receipt, saying that he made her a present of it. It was held (BRAMWELL, B., dissenting) that this was a payment which stopped the running of the statute. On the other hand, if money of the debtor comes to the hands of the creditor, and the creditor retains it without instructions to that effect, this will raise a case of set-off rather than of payment: see *Thomas v. Cross* (7 Ex. 728).

Upon this state of the authorities KEKEWICH, J., had to deal with the facts in *Re Boswell* (*supra*). In August, 1904, a creditor's action was commenced for the administration of the estate of J. F. BOSWELL, deceased, and by the judgment, dated in November, 1904, the usual inquiry was directed as to the testator's debts. According to the established rule, the judgment stopped the running of the statute as against all debts not then barred. The testator's estate was insolvent. A claim for over £5,000 was brought in by Mr. M. S. EMERSON, a Norwich solicitor, the greater part being for the unpaid balance of costs incurred in the protracted litigation of *Boswell v. Coaks*, which was concluded in 1888. The bills of costs upon which the claim was founded, and which were not delivered till after the testator's death, included, with that action, matters extending over a period of more than thirty years. The plaintiff in *Re Boswell* set up the Statute of Limitations in answer to the claim. It was admitted that there had been a payment on general account by the testator in 1893, and also a special payment by him on account of the costs in *Boswell v. Coaks* in 1894, but any later payments were denied. The claimant, however, alleged certain transactions between 1896 and 1904 as keeping the balance of the general account alive. In 1896 the testator, upon being pressed, made a payment of £20 on account, expressing his regret that he was not in a position to pay more. In 1897 an advance was obtained for the testator by Mr. EMERSON upon

certain policies, and, after payment of an existing charge, there was a balance of £69, which by the testator's instructions he retained on account of his indebtedness to him. In 1902 Mr. EMERSON recovered a debt of £32 4s. 2d. for the testator, and, again by the testator's instructions, retained £2 4s. 2d. on account of his own debt. In 1902 there were dealings with another policy, which resulted in Mr. EMERSON having about £43 in hand, and the testator directed him to retain this on account. Finally, in 1904, a third party, who was interested with the testator and others in the action of *Boswell v. Coaks*, made a payment of £20 towards the testator's costs, and Mr. EMERSON placed this to the testator's credit.

As to these successive transactions it is to be noticed that the payment of £20 by the testator in 1896, since it was more than six years before the judgment in the action, did not help the claimant unless the subsequent dealings amounted to payment by the testator for the purpose of excluding the statute. It might have been supposed that this effect would have been allowed to them, at any rate as to all except the last. The contribution by the third party was not, as KEKEWICH, J., observed, made on account of the testator or in part payment of his debt, but in recognition of a moral obligation. But in the other cases the solicitor had in his hands money of the testator which, according to the evidence, he appears to have applied at the testator's direction to reduction of the balance of the debt. KEKEWICH, J., however, took a different view, and referred in support of it to *Waugh v. Cops* (6 M. & W. 824) and *Thomas v. Cross* (7 Ex. 728). But in the former case a payment was held not to imply a promise to pay, because it did not appear to recognize the existence of a larger debt, and in the latter the retention of the money was, in the events which happened, not authorized by the debtor. It is not clear, therefore, that these cases forbade the implication of a promise to pay in the present case. The rejection, however, of any such implication arising out of the transactions of 1897, 1902, and 1904 destroyed the claimant's case, and made it unnecessary to determine with precision the effect of the payment made by the testator in 1896. The argument in opposition to the claimant had been that this, not having been appropriated to any particular item by the testator, ought to be appropriated exclusively to the earliest of the non-statute-barred items in the account; but KEKEWICH, J., observed that the question was not one to be decided hastily, and he suggested, in accordance with *Walker v. Butler* (*supra*), that it would be attributable to all the non-barred items. The effect would be to reduce the outstanding balance on such items and to exclude the statute as to the unpaid part, and this seems to be the practical way of dealing with the matter. But where the parties are themselves silent or vague as to the appropriation of payments, and where so much is left to implication, it is hardly possible to expect the courts to arrive at a perfectly satisfactory result. The moral is that accounts should not be left outstanding so long.

Guests at the annual dinner of the Central Criminal Court Bar will, says the *Evening Standard*, miss a feature for which their predecessors were wont always to look. On such an occasion as this, and after the dinner on the last day of the sessions, a man whom all the old hands knew used regularly to attend. When the last course had been served, in would come a man who was neither guest nor waiter. Habited in decent black, grave yet authoritative of mien, he would make his bow to the company and await the glass of wine which he knew would be forthcoming. This he would drink to the health of those present. With unaffected modesty he would express his gratitude for past favours, and his hopes for favours to come. The man in black was Calcraft, the hangman.

The Lord Chancellor was presented with the freedom of the Burgh of Annan on the 11th inst. In his reply Lord Loreburn said that reference had been made to the great office which he had the presumption and boldness to undertake. It required courage to undertake so onerous and so difficult a task, and it was apt to provoke misgivings when he recalled the great men who had filled the place before, and who had left their names imprinted on the history of Great Britain. How the task would be discharged he did not know in the least, but he would endeavour to do his best, and he felt sure that he should have the support and the encouragement of his friends in Annan and in all the other parts of the Dumfries burghs. In the past they had overlooked his faults, rejoiced with him in his success, and had encouraged him when he was in doubt. That was his hope for the future. He hoped that he would often be among them again, and he assured them that, if they would be the same men to him, he would always be the same man to them.

Executor's Right to Appointed Land.

THE pith of Part I. of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, by which realty vests in the personal representative, is contained in sub-sections 1 and 2 of section 1. Sub-section 1 enacts that real estate is to vest in the personal representative "as if it were a chattel real." Sub-section 2 is: "This section shall apply to any real estate over which a person executes by will a general power of appointment, as if it were real estate vested in him." Referring back to sub-section 1, this seems to mean that appointed real estate is to vest in the personal representative instead of in the appointee, in the same way that a chattel real vests in the personal representative and not in the legatee, or (in the case of appointed personality) the appointee. This again throws one back to the law relating to the vesting of personality in the executor, &c., where the personality is not the property of the testator, but is only subject to the testator's general power of appointment by will. There appears to be no decided case since 1897 upon the subject of the exact nature of the manner in which appointed land will vest in the executor. The subject of the executor's right to appointed personality—when the power is general to appoint by will—has, however, received some elucidation in the cases decided during the last five years, and these cases will, first of all, be considered.

The question was raised in *Re Treasure* (1900, 2 Ch. 648) whether an appointed fund of personality passed to the executor "as such," and it was held by KEKEWICH, J., that "the appointed fund does not pass to the executors as such . . . but because . . . the donees of the power must be considered to have appointed the property to the executors as trustees." This was followed by the same learned judge's decision in *Re Maddock* (1901, 2 Ch. 372), and by *Re Power* (1901, 2 Ch. 659), a decision by BYRNE, J., to the same effect. On the other hand, BUCKLEY, J., took a contrary view in *Re Moore* (1901, 1 Ch. 691) and in *Re Dixon* (1902, 1 Ch. 248). In *Re Fearnside* (1903, 1 Ch. 250) SWINFEN EADY, J., took a view somewhere between these two conflicting views, and held that property actually received by an executor did pass to him "as such" within the meaning of the Finance Act, 1894. BUCKLEY, J., in *Re Dixon*, at p. 257, stated the question to be: "Whether fictionally the donee of the power is supposed to appoint, first to his executor to such extent as is necessary for payment of his debts in a due course of administration, and then to the appointees, or whether the appointment as a beneficial disposition is taken to be what it is upon its face—namely, an appointment to certain appointees, and the executor's right is a right to recover, not as appointee, but as executor adversely to the appointees by virtue of his right as executor to avoid *pro tanto* the beneficial disposition of the property which the appointor in fact makes." The latter of these alternatives is, of course, BUCKLEY, J.'s own view, and the decision of the House of Lords in *Beufus v. Lawley* (1903, A. C. 411) seems to settle the question in favour of that view—*i.e.*, that personality appointed by will under a general power does pass to the executor *virtute officii*.

The question in *Beufus v. Lawley* was whether a fund of personality, subject to a general power of appointment by will, could be effectively charged in favour of a person who had lent the appointor money on the faith of his interest or power, and had taken from him a covenant to appoint by will in the would-be mortgagee's favour. The will was duly made, appointing the fund as covenanted, but it was held that the creditor was in no better position than if he had been a mere volunteer, and that he had only the same rights as other creditors. Lord LINDLEY said: "It cannot now be denied that property appointed by will under a general power is assets for payment of the debts of the appointor, and is not regarded as property of the donor of the power distributable by the donee thereof . . . personal property appointed by will under a general power, although not a legacy for all purposes, is treated as personal estate bequeathed by him." It seems consistent with this that the executor's right should be regarded as adverse to the appointee, in the same way that it may be regarded as adverse to the legatee, when the property is required for payment of debts; as in this case, the

assent of the executor is necessary before the legatee can claim or make a title to his legacy, so in the same way it would seem now that the assent of the executor is also necessary in the case of the appointed property, and that such property does pass to the executor "as such."

The only distinctions, in fact, which are still left between personal property which is owned by a testator, and property over which he has merely a general power and which he appoints by will, are that he can effectively charge the one by a covenant during his lifetime and cannot so charge the other, and that debts will be paid out of the testator's own property before the appointed property is made available. (The case of a power to appoint, and an appointment, by deed *inter vivos* is *ex hypothesi* excluded.)

It will be noticed that in the above extract from the judgment of Lord LINDLEY a distinction is drawn between "property" and "personal property," and the distinction was drawn advisedly, for Lord LINDLEY was not concerned with stating the law as to appointed realty under Part I. of the Land Transfer Act, 1897. Apart from that enactment, land appointed by will under a general power would still vest in the appointee, though, if the power were only equitable, the appointee could hardly get in the legal estate without seeing that the property was not subject to debts. Whether the legal estate vested in the appointee, or whether—the power being equitable—it remained where it was, the interest actually appointed would, as in the case of personality, be available for payment of the appointor's debts in due course of administration.

What, then, is the exact effect of sub-sections 1 and 2 above referred to? Although it is possible to construe these enactments as saying that "appointable" realty is to vest in the executor precisely as the testator's own realty vests—thus in effect completely abrogating the distinction between power and property—it seems the sounder construction to proceed *reddendo singula singulis* and to take the sub-sections as intending to say that "appointable" realty is to vest in the executor in the same way as "appointable" personality. The same distinction will then exist as in the case of personality—*viz.*, that the donee of the power, or testator, cannot effectively charge the realty in his lifetime, and that the property itself will only be liable for payment of debts when the testator's own property is exhausted. And the same question as was stated by BUCKLEY, J., in the extract from *Re Dixon* given above, with respect to personality, may be stated with respect to realty: "Does the executor take as appointee, or as executor adversely to the appointees?" If the analogy of personality is to be followed, it is submitted that the executor will take "as such," or *virtute officii*. And, as already remarked, this does not involve the complete abrogation of the distinction between property belonging to the testator, and property appointed by him.

It is stated that Mr. Bryans Ackland, solicitor, of Saffron Walden, was found dead in bed on Monday last. He was Registrar of the Bishop's Stortford County Court and clerk to the Saffron Walden Justices.

At the end of *Watts v. Stevens* (1906, 2 K. B., at p. 339), says "F. P.," writing in the *Law Quarterly Review*, will be found a note on the pagination of Blackstone's Commentaries. It was much condensed by reason of the small space available, and some of our readers may like to have a little more detail. The marginal pagination by which Blackstone's Commentaries have been referred to for more than a century was introduced in the twelfth edition, 1793, the first with Christian's notes. The advertisement, vol. i., p. ix, states that "the pages of the former editions are preserved in the margin." Now this statement is incorrect. The publishers of 1793 preserved, in fact, the paging of the tenth edition, 1765, which corresponds nearly, but not quite, with that of the ninth edition (the first with editorial notes, by Burn), 1783; this ninth edition is not to be found in the Inns of Court or the Law Society's library, but has been verified in the British Museum copy. There are considerable variations between the ninth and tenth editions in the third volume, elsewhere the discrepancy is only slight and occasional. Again, the ninth edition does not reproduce the paging of the editions published in Blackstone's lifetime. Those editions appear to have been uniform in paging notwithstanding the change from quarto to octavo form, so that the dislocation of the original numbering must have been due to the insertion of additional footnotes, as in like manner further increase of the notes accounts for the variance between the ninth and tenth editions. The actual paging of the twelfth and later editions need not be considered. It appears on the whole, then, that owners of any edition of the Commentaries earlier than the tenth cannot safely use their copies for the purpose of making references.

Reviews.

Repairs and Improvements.

THE LAW OF REPAIRS AND IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING ECCLESIASTICAL DILAPIDATIONS. By J. H. JACKSON, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Butterworth & Co.

The subject of repairs and improvements to property is one of great practical importance, and the author of this book has usefully collected into one volume the principles of the subject as they affect (1) limited owners, part owners, and persons under disability, (2) landlord and tenant, (3) vendor and purchaser, and (4) ecclesiastical dilapidations. These divisions constitute the four parts of the book. The liability of a tenant for life to do repairs was rejected by Kay, J., in *Re Cartwright* (41 Ch. D. 532), and the cases on such liability are discussed at the beginning of Part I., but in the case of limited owners repairs and improvements are chiefly governed by statutory regulations, and these, including the Settled Land Acts and the Agricultural Holdings Acts, are discussed in detail. Attention may be called to the useful list given at pp. 101-104 of works which have been judicially sanctioned. The subject of repairs calls, as is well known, for frequent consideration in cases between landlord and tenant, and the minute exposition which is given of the effect of words usually occurring in covenants to repair will be found useful by the practitioner; in particular the effect of a covenant to "keep" and to "leave" a house in "good tenable repair," having regard to *Proudfoot v. Hart* (38 W. R. 730, 25 Q. B. D. 42), and the measure of damages for breach of a covenant to repair, whether during the currency of the term or on its determination, on which *Conquest v. Ebbetts* (45 W. R. 50; 1896, A. C. 490), is a leading case. Equal thoroughness has been bestowed upon the concluding part dealing with ecclesiastical dilapidations, and the provisions of the Ecclesiastical Dilapidations Act, 1871, are carefully stated. The book altogether is a useful compendium of the subject.

The Law of Evidence.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE LAW OF EVIDENCE. WITH ELEMENTARY RULES FOR CONDUCTING THE EXAMINATION AND CROSS-EXAMINATION OF WITNESSES. By W. M. BEST, A.M., LL.B. TENTH EDITION. WITH A COLLECTION OF LEADING PROPOSITIONS. By J. M. LELY, Barrister-at-Law. Sweet & Maxwell (Limited).

"Best on Evidence" is known as one of the two standard works on this important branch of jurisprudence, and the occasion of a new edition has been used to incorporate various matters of recent interest. The question of mistaken identity has been brought prominently forward in the *Beck case*, and a statement of the case, taken from the report of the Committee of Inquiry, is given, together with an extract from the report. This concludes with the suggestion that the time has come for abolishing the anomaly of pardoning a man who ought never to have been convicted, and adopting the simpler remedy of quashing the conviction on motion by the Attorney-General and entering an acquittal as of record, a suggestion in which Mr. Lely also urges in the preface. It is hard to understand how there can be any difficulty in adopting such a suggestion when once it has been made. An outline is now given also of the *Tichborne case*, which will be useful as a guide to the points which were raised by that famous trial. The question of handwriting is one which frequently occasions criticism, especially where expert evidence is offered, and in Book II. a full examination of the common law doctrine as to evidence by comparison of writings is given, with a statement at length of the *Fitzwater Peerage case* (10 Cl. & F. 193), where such evidence was rejected, and reference to *Doe v. Suhermore* (5 A. & E. 703), where the court was divided in opinion as to its admission. The matter was regulated by section 27 of the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, now replaced by the Criminal Procedure Act, 1865, ss. 1, 8, but it is pointed out, with reason, that all proof of handwriting is, even in its best form, precarious and often extremely dangerous. The utility of the book is increased by the collection of leading propositions which form Book V., and attention may be called to the important discussion in Book III., Part II., of the admission of secondary evidence and the various modes in which such evidence can be given of documents.

Books of the Week.

The Principles of Pleading and Practice in Civil Actions in the High Court of Justice. By W. BLAKE ODGERS, M.A., LL.D., K.C. Sixth Edition. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The Law Quarterly Review. Edited by Sir Frederick Pollock, Bart., D.C.L., LL.D. October, 1906. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

Correspondence.

The Law Society and Land Transfer.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In your report of my speech at the Manchester meeting, introducing a resolution disapproving of compulsory registration of title, I am reported as having stated that I had actually prepared a paper on the subject to read at the meeting, and that the Council would not accept it. This is not quite correct. I did not prepare a paper, as my offer to do so was refused by the Council.

The correspondence that passed between the society and myself on the subject would, I believe, be of interest to your readers. I am communicating with the society to ascertain if the Council object to the letters being published.

J. S. RUBINSTEIN.

5 and 6, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn, London, Oct. 17.

Points to be Noted.

Company Law.

Reduction of Capital—Return of Capital.—From 1862 to 1867 a company—at any rate if registered under the Act of 1862—could not reduce its capital. Section 9 of the Act of 1867 provided as follows: "Any company limited by shares may, by special resolution . . . if authorized to do so by its regulations . . . reduce its capital, but no such resolution . . . shall come into operation until an order of the court is registered by the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies as is hereinafter mentioned." According to that section the resolution is to "come into operation" when the order of the court is registered. But something else has to be done before the resolution can "come into operation" or "take effect"—which is the same thing—for section 15 says: "The registrar . . . upon production to him of [the] order . . . and the delivery to him of a copy of the order and of a minute (approved by the court) shewing, with respect to the capital of the company, as altered by the order, the amount of such capital," and other particulars, "shall register the order and minute, and on the registration the special resolution confirmed by the order so registered shall take effect." By section 3 of the Companies Act, 1877, "the power to reduce capital conferred by" the Act of 1867 "shall include a power . . . to pay off any capital which may be in excess of the wants of the company." In a case where Buckley, J., was asked to confirm a reduction of capital by returning excess capital he stated that his recollection of the practice in such cases was that it was as follows: "First, to make an order confirming the reduction; then to allow the further hearing of the petition to stand over in order that an affidavit might be supplied shewing that the repayment had been made, and then to post-date the order, referring therein to the affidavit and approving a minute stating what would then be the truth." That this was not the universal practice is shewn by *Re Artizans' Land and Mortgage Corporation* (1904, 1 Ch. 796), for there the question was, what was the period of limitation in the way of a shareholder who had not received his return of capital, although the reduction of capital involved in such return had been sanctioned by the court. Evidently some of the shareholders in that case had not received their share of the return before the order was completed. Mr. Justice Buckley's decision has not been followed by other judges. We understand that in the unreported case of *Re Estate, Finance, and Mines Corporation*, decided on the 7th of April, 1906 Mr. Justice Warrington followed the old practice; and in a later reported case Mr. Justice Swinfen Eady carefully considered Mr. Justice Buckley's decision, and refused to follow it. The reduction—notional it may be—does not take effect until the minute is registered, and until that is done the resolution ought not to be acted on.—*RE CALGARY AND EDMONTON LAND CO* (Buckley, J., Dec. 19, 1905) (1906, 1 Ch. 141); *RE LEES BROOK SPINNING CO.* (Swinfen Eady, J., June 1, 1906) (1906, 2 Ch. 394).

Winding Up—Assets Covered by Debentures.—The old head-note of the report of *Re Chapel House Colliery Co.* (24 Ch. 239) is still the law, at any rate to this extent, that "although as a general rule an unpaid creditor of a company which cannot pay its debt is entitled to a winding-up order, that order will not be made when it is shewn that the petitioning creditor cannot gain anything by a winding-up order." In the last case on the subject *Romer, L.J.*, said: "If it was proved that no possible benefit could accrue to the unsecured creditors, I should agree . . . that a winding-up order ought not to be made." On the other hand, recent decisions seem to have shifted the onus from the petitioning creditor to those who are opposing a winding-up petition. Mr. Justice Buckley in *Re Alfred Nelson & Co. (Limited)* (1906, 1 Ch. 845) said that in certain cases "the principle was adopted that a creditor who comes for a winding-up order must in general

show that there is some expectation of obtaining payment of something under the order when other creditors oppose the petition." In the case before the Court of Appeal (to which we have referred) other creditors—to wit, debenture-holders—did oppose; but the Master of the Rolls said: "The onus is clearly on the debenture-holders to negative [the] possibility" "of the creditors reaping any fruits out of" a winding-up order. This is only repeating in substance what Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams (as he then was) laid down fourteen years ago in *Re Krasnapolsky Restaurant Co.* (1892, 3 Ch. 174). In *Re Chapel House Colliery Co.* the opposition of the debenture-holders was successful. Nowadays it is not enough to shew that the debentures cover the total assets, and are to secure an amount exceeding the value of those assets, for debentures may possibly be upset and advantage may accrue from the liquidator, on behalf of the company, being the real defendant in an action to enforce the debenture-holders' security. Again, the opposition to a winding-up petition of a company which has fully mortgaged its assets is not available. The only opposition which will be listened to is that of a substantial majority of other *unsecured* creditors—those of the same class as that to which the petitioner belongs.—*RE CRIGGLESTONE COAL CO.* (C. A., May 31) (1906, 2 Ch. 327).

Cases of the Week.

Before the Vacation Judge.

Re J. H. SELKIRK (LIM.) (PETITION OF ASSOCIATED NEWSPAPERS (LIM.)). 17th Oct.

COMPANY—WINDING UP—VOLUNTARY WINDING UP PENDING—BENEFIT TO CREDITORS.

Petition by creditors to wind up the respondent company. It appeared from the petition and affidavits that the company was registered on the 30th of September, 1905, with a capital of £4,000 in shares of £1 each. Of these 3,300 had been issued, 2,294 being held by a Mr. Selkirk, who was the promoter and vendor and also the sole director and manager of the company. Mr. Selkirk's business, sold to the company and carried on by them, was that of advertising agents, and the debt of the petitioning creditors, Associated Newspapers (Limited), which amounted to £603, was the amount of a judgment with costs obtained by them against the respondent company in respect of advertisements inserted in their newspapers by them and not paid for. On the 24th of September last the respondents' registered office was closed, and a notice affixed thereto referred inquirers to a certain gentleman whose name and address was given, but who at the time was abroad. On the 27th of September a resolution was passed to wind the company up voluntarily, the above gentleman being made liquidator. On the 31st of July previous a mortgage of all its property, including the uncalled capital, was granted by the company to Mr. Selkirk to secure a sum of £5,188 alleged to be due from it to him. The company was insolvent. It was contended on behalf of the petitioners that the granting of the mortgage amounted to a fraudulent preference of Mr. Selkirk to other creditors, and was therefore void, and that the resolution to wind up voluntarily was not passed *bona fide*, but in order to defeat the company's creditors, and that as the control of the winding up would in effect be in the hands of Mr. Selkirk, the creditors would be injured. This petition was supported by creditors for £2,000. The following passage from the judgment of Lindley, L.J., in *Re National Debenture and Assets Corporation* (1891, 2 Ch., at p. 518), was read: "It comes, therefore, now to the simple question of whether it is necessary and proper for the protection of the creditors to make a compulsory winding-up order instead of continuing the supervision order. . . . The company is a curious company, there is a great deal to be found out, and the powers of the court, especially now since the modifications which have been made by last year's Act [the Companies (Winding-up) Act, 1890], to inquire into tricks or malpractices under a compulsory order, are very considerably larger than they are under a voluntary winding up. Under the circumstances the creditors are entitled, in my opinion, to have a compulsory order." The voluntary winding up was no bar to the order asked for if the general body of creditors desired it, although no one of them could prove that the voluntary winding up prejudiced him (*Re Bishop & Sons (Limited)* (1900, 2 Ch. 255)), and here the great bulk of the creditors supported the petition. On behalf of the respondents it was contended that the petition was opposed by ordinary trade creditors to the amount of £800, and that consequently this was merely a question as between two sets of creditors as to the way in which the winding up should be conducted. Nothing could be obtained under a compulsory winding up that could not be obtained in the voluntary winding up. It was admitted that the granting of the mortgage constituted a fraudulent preference, but any money improperly taken could be recovered in the pending winding up. The case of *Re Bishop & Sons (Limited)* was a different case from the present one, for there ninety per cent. of the creditors supported the petition, while a much smaller proportion did so in this case. Under section 145 of the Companies Act, 1862, a petitioner had to shew that his rights would be prejudiced by a voluntary winding up, but no evidence to that effect was given in this case.

BARON VANE DRAKE, J., said he would not call on the petitioner for a reply. The present case seemed to him one of those cases in which there should be a compulsory order. When he found that the company started with a

capital of £4,000; that Mr. Selkirk, the promoter, held the majority of the shares which had been issued, and that the whole of the assets of the company, including the uncalled capital, had been granted to him, it seemed to him that it was a case of the greatest suspicion. There must be the usual order to wind up.—COUNSEL, *D. Stewart-Smith, K.C.*, and *E. P. Hewitt; Richard Nevill; Woodfin.* SOLICITORS, *W. H. Smith & Son; Piesse & Sons; W. B. Glasier.*

[Reported by W. L. L. BELL, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.]

Law Societies.

The Law Society.

THE ANNUAL PROVINCIAL MEETING.

As we mentioned last week, two of the papers prepared for the meeting were not read, owing to lack of time. One of these, by Mr. H. KINGALEY Wood, of the City of London, was on

AN ASPECT OF MODERN LEGISLATION.

"The public good," said Bentham, "ought to be the object of the legislator; general utility ought to be the foundations of his reasons. To know the true good of the community is what constitutes the science of legislation; the art consists in finding the means to realize that good." How far does modern legislation embody these ideals? If these words were written over the portals of the Houses of Parliament, or in some other way constantly brought before every aspiring legislator, would so many "sundrie lovable Acts of Parliament" (to quote Fletcher of Saltoun) be found on our present day statute book? Legislation, therefore, according to our text, exists for the common good, secures our natural and independent rights, and restrains lawlessness. The late Mr. Witt, K.C., gave another reason. He says, "Why does every session bring forth a crop of Acts altering the general law of the land? The answer is, no Government can afford to produce a King's Speech without a list of projected statutory reforms." In other words, politicians must live and move and have their being. As we not more and more at the mercy of those who are for ever on the look out, no doubt from the best motives, to tinker, patch, or overthrow? Cannot we say with Byron—

"I would all men were free
As well from kings as mobs, from you as me!"

Individual liberty is being daily sacrificed at the altar of uniformity of human conduct. The independent and sturdy citizen is being replaced by one of a like cast to his fellow. His principal duty in the life of the State is to obey, and pay rates and taxes. We need not look far for illustrations of many of these "lovable Acts." The Shop Hours Act was a measure that received little attention. Yet from one point of view it went to swell the great and grave constitutional changes that are being made. Once this Act is in operation and a notice thrust into the hands of the tradesmen, then forthwith his business must be closed at a particular hour on a particular day. The aforesaid tradesman may have a different idea, so may his customers, but an inexorable law bids him do as his fellows and be thankful. It is not surprising that indignation has arisen, and corporation committees have decided to take no more action under the Act. "Modern legislation," says an eminent authority, "is restless, bold, and also insubstantial in its dealings with the daily concerns of life. We say, 'An Englishman's home is his castle!' We have seen what happens if the castle degenerates into a shop. The modern Englishman cannot nowadays build his castle as he likes, either as to the labour he employs or the material wherewith he builds. If the aforesaid castle is in the County of London, a worse fate befalls him, for he must reckon with another 'lovable' enactment—the Land Transfer Act. With a truly magnificent irresponsibility the landowners—big or small—of the County of London have been sacrificed for an experiment of compulsory land registration.

"In mad game
They break their manacles to wear the name
Of freedom, graven on a heavier chain."

It is a good principle that there should be correspondence between legislation and public opinion. Here we have public opinion stifled and inquiry refused. "Letting alone," said John Stuart Mill, "should be the general practice; every departure from it unless required by some great good is a certain evil." It is not a great difficulty to obtain the consent of a friend to act as executor of a will or trustee of its fund. There is no public outcry for a public official to act in this capacity. There is no long-felt want. Englishmen do not like officials; yet, as a sign of the times, a Public Trustee Act looks large, and we see visions of public buildings, London and district offices, and the usual paraphernalia. Even the Lord Chancellor is not forgotten! In the event of a real difficulty the public trustee can be excused. The intimate relations of trustee and beneficiary are to be at an end, and the public are again to have thrust upon them something they have never asked for and do not want. The careless and improvident expenditure of public money is a matter that considerably bears upon this subject. That this goes up by leaps and bounds, while the necessary checks and control have gradually but surely diminished is another serious aspect of the question. In conclusion, modern legislation in many instances (and admittedly from one aspect of the matter) means the machine-made citizen. We are in danger of forgetting we are a collection of units, not one of which is like his fellows; of encouraging parental irresponsibility by nationalizing the child; filial irresponsibility by such

schemes as old age pensions; and individual irresponsibility by shifting burdens from the citizen to the official—from one upon all. Herbert Spencer says, "Let it be seen that a future of a nation depends on the nature of its units . . . of the ends to be kept in view by the legislator, all are unimportant compared with the end of character-making; and yet character-making is an end wholly unrecognized."

The other paper was by Mr. JOHN JAMES COULTON, of Lynn, on
OUR LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL SYSTEMS.

Our legislative and judicial systems are a subject which has long engaged my attention. It has now become prominent, and I gladly take this opportunity of submitting my views to the profession. Beginning with legislation, we all know the mistakes, the trouble, the expensive and harassing litigation, which have followed inaccurate and sometimes really unintelligible expressions in Acts of Parliament, requiring interpretation (not always satisfactory) by courts of law or equity and not seldom by our ultimate tribunal, the House of Lords. In a case which occurred recently and is still pending, doubt has been thrown by high judicial authority on the construction, hitherto unquestioningly accepted, of a clause in the Education Act, a doubt which must be settled either by appeal or by an amending or declaring Act which cannot be expected to pass without discussion. If while still a Bill awaiting its third reading in the Commons this Act had been settled by competent legal draftsmen, say perhaps their chief clerk assisted by the law officers of the Crown, whose appointments, sure roads to the bench, ought, I submit, to debar them from private practice, might not this uncertain wording have been made clear? Proceeding to judicature. Is it not generally thought that the High Court bench is undermined? Steps towards strengthening it have been taken, but these, I submit, are inadequate. Is not the time of life at which judges are usually appointed too far advanced? Ought the bench is to be a place of rest after long years of hard work or a place of earlier, higher, and better work? Ought a new judge to be one who has spent his best years at the bar? I venture to suggest that good High Court judges might be drawn from the more active and able judges of county courts, whose stipend, adequately increased, might still be much below those of the present High Court judges. Might not some such arrangement provide a much-needed addition to the number of High Court judges without permanently increasing the cost of the judicial staff? And have we not too long a chain of courts? How can we reckon when a suit will end? Would it not simplify legal proceedings if a county court, assize court, or quarter sessions judgment were appealable to three High Court judges, their judgment, if unanimous, to be final? If not, a final appeal to a High Court judge, chosen by and from his peers. The appellable jurisdiction of the House of Lords would cease, but the functions of the Lord Chancellor (or Lord Keeper) as Speaker of the House and confidential adviser of the Crown would remain. Moreover, ought there not to be an age at which any judges should retire? A retired judge might still be young enough to be a successful and useful writer on law, or even, as I believe is the case in America, to practise it. One other topic, and I will conclude. Why should all the judges of a much enlarged High Court always sit in London? Why not a quorum of three occasionally, as circumstances may require, in large provincial towns—say, as a beginning, Bristol, Manchester, Newcastle and Norwich? Would not this be another step in the direction of bringing justice to every man's door? And might it not do something to check the extension of our overgrown and still growing Metropolis?

Bristol Incorporated Law Society.

The following are extracts from the report of the council:

Land Registration.—At the request of the Law Society questions were addressed to each of the Parliamentary candidates for this city at the recent General Election, inquiring whether they would oppose further compulsory registration pending an impartial inquiry into the working hitherto of the Land Transfer Act, 1897; and also whether, pending such an inquiry, they were in favour of the present compulsory registration being suspended, leaving owners of land free to register or not as they found most to their advantage. To these inquiries only one reply, beyond a formal acknowledgment, was received, and this was in favour of the course indicated by the first question.

Legal Education.—The council are glad to be able to report the receipt of a grant of £150 for this year (as against £75 for the year preceding) from the Law Society in aid of the above, in consequence of which the work has been able to be extended. Since the last report six courses of lectures have been delivered, three courses by Mr. A. M. Wilshe, barrister-at-law, for senior students, the subjects being respectively, "Contracts," "Contracts and Torts," and "Bankruptcy and the Law of Evidence"; and three courses by Mr. C. A. Chilton, solicitor, on the "Law of Property in Land," "Constitutional Law," and on "Rights in Private Relations and in Things Personal." The total number of students entering for these lectures was 44, many of whom attended each course. The average attendance has been good, and the reports of the lecturers satisfactory. On the result of the examinations held in connection therewith, a prize of law books to the value of £1 ls. was awarded by this society to each of the following—namely, Mr. J. G. Stanier, Mr. E. J. G. Higham, and Mr. P. J. Britherton. The council are glad to be able to state that, in response to their circular issued in January last, a considerable number of solicitors decided to pay the fees for their articulated clerks' attendance at these lectures.

The Council of the Law Society.—The term for which the extraordinary

members hereof were first elected under the new charter having expired, the Council of the Law Society resolved to make no alteration in the scheme for the election of these members, and this society therefore still remains amongst those ungrouped societies who nominate a member individually. Mr. F. F. Cartwright, who was nominated by this society in 1903, to the great regret of his colleagues and the profession, died in April last, and at a special general meeting of this society, held in June last, Mr. F. Sturge was nominated and has since been elected an extraordinary member in his place. The council desire to remind the profession that, as the retention by this society of its place with the ungrouped societies depends to some extent at any rate upon the number of members of the Law Society within its district, it is important that this membership should not be allowed to diminish, but that on this, as well as on other grounds, efforts should be made to increase it.

Law Students' Journal.

Law Students' Societies.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.—Oct. 9.—Chairman, Mr. Ion Atkins.—The subject for discussion was: "That the codification of the English law is desirable." The speakers in the affirmative were Messrs. G. M. Bark, B.A., LL.B., J. Moore Bayley, B.A., E. H. Clutterbuck, G. A. Baker, and W. H. C. Sharp, B.A.; and in the negative Messrs. A. J. Gateley, E. W. Tunbridge, C. S. H. Ducheman, and G. H. J. Cowley. After the leaders on both sides had replied, the chairman summed up, and on a vote being taken the motion was lost by four votes.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.—Oct. 16.—Chairman, Mr. P. M. C. Hart.—The subject for debate was: "That the case of *Re Bennett, Ward v. Bennett* (1906, 1 Ch. 216), was wrongly decided." Mr. A. J. Fere Bass opened in the affirmative, and Mr. G. Harston seconded in the affirmative; Mr. Kraus opened in the negative, and Mr. Dowding seconded in the negative. The following members continued the debate: For the motion, Mr. H. T. Thomson; against the motion, Messrs. Pleadwell and Fitton. The motion was lost by eleven votes.

The Land Registry.

The report of the Registrar of the Land Registry for the years 1902, 1903, 1904, and 1905, as to the work of constructing a General Register of Title for the County of London has just been issued. The first and second parts relate to the work of the registry, which we hope hereafter to print, but the third part contains matter of so much importance that we give it at once in full:

PART III.—SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER LEGISLATION.

I will now venture to submit a few points in which I think further legislation would be desirable. They relate to (1) certain amendments of detail in the system of registration itself, (2) greater facilities for extension of the system into other parts of the country, and (3) the general registration of absolute instead of possessory titles.

1. **Amendment of the Acts.**—One of the advantages of the extensive application given to the Land Transfer Acts during the last seven years is that experience has been gained of their application to a great variety of unforeseen circumstances, and a large amount of professional talent has been expended on a scrutiny of some of their less obvious features and characteristics. While the results have been favourable to the Acts as a whole (as shown by the entire absence of definite complaint in regard to ordinary transactions) there are nevertheless a few points on which it would seem that amendment might be desirable. The chief of these appear to me to be the fuller definition of the position of the registered proprietor of land—especially as regards notice and the legal estate—and strengthening of the powers of the creditor under a registered charge. This is hardly the occasion for entering in great detail into these somewhat technical matters; it may suffice to state the principal recommendations I have to make upon them, which are these: (1) It appears questionable whether when land is registered, and therefore questions of priority are largely disposed of by the mere order of registration, any really useful purpose is served by retaining the time-honoured distinction between the legal and equitable estate. The clauses required to remove this distinction would need careful drafting, and acquaintance with various anomalies that have grown out of it, for which express provision would have to be made. (2) The registered proprietor for the time being should have the fee simple (the legal fee simple, if the distinction is not abolished) vested in him, and all powers properly incident thereto, and it should be inalienable except by a registered disposition. (3) The position and powers of the registered proprietor of a charge, and of those who deal with him, should be somewhat more precisely defined. Further regulations in regard to the creditor acquiring and disposing of the legal estate will also be desirable. (4) It should be laid down more clearly than it is at present that a registered purchaser or mortgagee is not affected even by express notice of an adverse equitable right unless that right is protected by caution or otherwise on the register. If these alterations were made, or even the last three only, the chief objections felt by conveyancers to relying entirely on the Acts in dealings with registered land would, I think, be removed; the registered proprietorship would acquire the full value that it was intended to possess, the practice of executing extraneous deeds, and certain other ingenious but inconvenient and cumbrous expedients which are now

sometimes recommended as a protection against possible contingencies or dealings with registered land would practically drop out of use.

2. *Extension to Other Counties.*—The London registers being now fairly started, the extension of the general register to the rest of England and Wales naturally presents itself for consideration. As the Act stands at present, this question, which may reasonably claim to be treated as a national one, seems likely to remain practically a local one for an indefinite period. The orders establishing general registration from time to time are to be made by the Privy Council, and if earlier Bills are consulted, it will be seen that down to 1897 this was the whole provision proposed to be made. But owing to clauses first inserted in 1897, the Privy Council cannot make the necessary order without the previous invitation of the county council of the county to be affected. This provision has, I believe, already served the full purpose for which it was inserted by the Legislature, and as it imposes considerable drawbacks on the progress of reform, I may be pardoned, perhaps, for urging some considerations in favour of removing it, and of restoring to the Privy Council the full powers proposed to be conferred on them in the earlier Bills—which Bills, it may be remembered, were passed unanimously by the House of Lords on a number of occasions. For one thing, if I remember rightly, the restriction was inserted in deference to a feeling that the incidence of compulsory registration in a county might cause such a general dislocation of business as to bring all ordinary transactions to a standstill, with great attendant inconvenience and loss to the persons intended to be benefited. The following extracts from the speeches of opponents of the Act on the third reading debate in the House of Commons illustrate this feeling: "If the legislation should be a failure, it would inflict enormous loss and inconvenience upon landowners in the county where the experiment was tried." "Compulsory registration would increase the cost of working-men's houses to an intolerable extent." "When it was known that the conveyances for every small house in every small street had to be registered there would be a perfect uproar on the subject." "The effect of the measure would be to put a stop to the transfer of land in Greater London for a long period." Accordingly, the provision to which I am now referring was introduced as a check upon any rash action of the kind, together with a further temporary safeguard that till the expiration of three years after the making of the first order no further order was to be made. It is now eight years since the making of the first order, and it has been clearly seen, by its application to the largest, the busiest, the most important, and the most conspicuous county in the whole country, that no such dislocation of business as was apprehended has occurred. With the exception of the slight temporary expense involved in the inauguration of the new system, which is on the whole less than the schedule to the Act itself propounded, it is unquestionable that business as a whole goes on exactly as it did before, while fresh properties are being placed on the register at a rate which at some seasons rises to over 150 a day. The easy manner in which this change has been effected is probably in large measure due to the gradual way in which the order came into operation. For the first two months only four parishes in the West End of London were affected, then eleven parishes in the East End were added, after six months more the rest of North London (except the City and North Woolwich) came in. South London followed in three groups of parishes, at intervals of three, four, and six months, while for various reasons the City was not added till nearly three years after that. But the work from the City is only about one-sixtieth of the rest of London, so it may be said that, substantially, in less than two years (January, 1899, to November, 1900), with about six months' preliminary preparation, the whole of London, which may be taken as the equivalent of seven ordinary counties in England and Wales, was brought under the system without any serious difficulty. Under these circumstances is it reasonable any longer to fear the possibility of a deadlock occurring in land transactions throughout the country generally, if the question of further extension were to be left to the Privy Council alone to decide? One or two further considerations may be mentioned in favour of removing the present restriction. One of the drawbacks of our present conveyancing system is its want of uniformity; in Middlesex and Yorkshire there are deed registries, in other counties none. In London there is a general register of title, in other counties its use is at the option of the individual landowner. Are we for an indefinite period to continue this state of things, with facilities for the addition of any number of further anomalies, caused by isolated counties here and there adopting registration of title under this Act, while the remainder retain their former various conditions, whatever they may happen to be? Not only would counties each have their own peculiar conveyancing law, but (owing to the definition of county contained in the Act, which includes borough) numerous boroughs would have a different law to that of the surrounding country or even to their own surrounding suburbs. That economy and convenience in administration would be better secured by leaving the question of extension to the central authority is, of course, so evident as hardly to need demonstration. The Privy Council would naturally proceed according to a regular prearranged plan: grouping the counties (where desirable) into districts according to local conditions; fixing district registries in the principal business centres, and, possibly, with a system of local agencies in smaller places—the whole being carried out in whatever manner might seem likely to lead to the greatest ultimate advantage of the public. It would be much more difficult to effect this if the system is to be applied piecemeal, according to the order in which invitations may arrive from the individual counties; these would be limited in their effect to their own particular areas (in many cases very small ones), and would take effect in a haphazard way, according to the varieties of local opinion—probably without much regard to the ultimate general efficiency of the

organization as a whole. Shortly, the objections to this part of the Act as it stands appears to be—(1) It renders progress beyond London unlikely for a very long time; (2) it may increase, and, perhaps, even perpetuate, anomaly—of which we already have more than enough; (3) progress, when made, will follow lines neither the most economical nor the most convenient. The way to avoid these objections would be to restore the initiative to the Privy Council, subject to such right (if any) of local objection as may be deemed necessary or desirable.

3. *An Inquiry.*—It may be suggested that before enlarging the powers of the Privy Council there should be an inquiry into the working of the Act. To this I have no objection to offer, provided the right issue is raised. Hitherto the demand for inquiry has usually been coupled with expressions indicating a very imperfect apprehension of the policy of the Act, and of the point to which attention should be directed. Not long ago it was suggested that the Land Registry ought to be already in a position to shew that registration of title under the conditions that exist in England does simplify titles and facilitate the transfer of land. From the preceding paragraphs 3, 4, and 40, it will be seen that such an expectation is not warranted by the principles of the Act—the curative effect of possessory registration being very gradual, and requiring probably twenty or thirty years to elapse before it would become generally noticeable. Only a small proportion of land is registered each year, and, consequently, even after twenty years, only a small proportion of sales will derive much benefit from the Act. I submit that the proper and principal subject for inquiry would be whether the public is or is not paying too heavy a price in present trouble and cost for the advantages which are to follow when the system has attained its full efficacy; whether the administration of the department is or is not as good as it might be; and whether any improvements can be suggested for more completely, rapidly, and conveniently carrying out the general objects of the Acts—namely, the registration, with absolute title, of all land in England and Wales.

4. *General Registration with Absolute Title.*—The experience gained with the applications for absolute title already received points very definitely to a conclusion which, if adopted, would, I think, greatly increase the usefulness and popularity of the Acts, and would remove almost the only remaining objection to them which is urged even by their well-known opponents. I mean that it would be possible, without increasing the initial fees for registration, to make all registered titles absolute instead of possessory from the beginning. That is to say, that the period of incubation (so to speak) of a registered title would be either eliminated altogether, or reduced to so short a duration as to be practically of no moment. The full benefits of the Acts would thus be secured for the public at once. The additional cost involved in the department could be defrayed by slightly increasing the subsequent fees, which, as they would be paid by persons who would benefit to a much larger extent by the diminished costs of conveyancing, would not be objected to by the public. The extreme rarity of any real defect in a title which has passed through a sale—especially if that sale be a public one—is well known to all persons of experience; and, considering that all the compulsorily registered titles are of this character, it ought not to be difficult to devise a system whereby the purchaser's investigations can be efficiently checked in the office at very small expense. In fact, we are already proceeding on this principle to a very great extent in the applications for absolute title made under the new rules. When all titles in a district come under review, one title usually throws light upon others, and in a short while, with proper indexing, there would be such an amount of information in this office as would enable us to treat many questions cheaply and with confidence, which in the case of private investigation would be costly and indecisive. I do not propose to enter more closely in this subject here, but if and when legislation is contemplated, I hope to be allowed to put forward suggestions in fuller detail. Further, when this process has advanced some way, and a fair proportion of land is on the register with absolute title, there should be power, by Order in Council, to provide for the similar general registration of the whole of the remainder within a short period. It will easily be seen that a general registration of all titles in a district at once can be conducted on much safer and more economical lines than registration of the same titles one by one according to the accident of sale. It is also fairly clear that when once registration of title has been definitely decided on as the system to be followed, and a certain number of the most saleable properties have been placed on the register by way of example, the further continuance of a double system of conveyancing in the country would be greatly to the disadvantage of both the landowners and the public, and that the Government should be given power to put a summary end to the anomaly with as little delay as possible. It would appear to be worth serious consideration whether the whole difficulty of providing the initial cost of establishing the registers might not be overcome by the expedient of raising a Government loan sufficient to pay the expenses, both public and private, of the whole operation of registering all good holding titles as absolute, to be repaid within a limited period out of the surplus fees on future registered dealings. There is reason to think that the fees might be adjusted so as to provide this amount, while still leaving a substantial immediate benefit to the public. On the expiration of the period fixed for repayments the benefit would, of course, become greatly enlarged.

PART IV.—POINTS OF PRACTICE

Finally, I desire to tender a few observations on certain inconveniences in practice which might be avoided if the principles of the Acts and rules were better understood and attended to. They relate to (1) the practice of preparing, and requiring execution of a double set of deeds on dealings with registered lands; (2) the practice of creditors under registered charges demanding the custody of the borrower's land certificate; and (3) the mode of preparing bills of costs in dealings with possessory titles.

* *Hansard's Parliamentary Debates*, Vol. LIII. 3 August, 1897, 599-620, and 4 August, 326-406.

1. *Deeds Off the Register.*—It will be remembered that one of the means employed under the registry system for simplifying transactions with land consists in the obligatory use of short clear forms of transfer and charge on the occasion of sales and mortgages. These forms contain no recitals or other matter foreign to the actual business in hand, they avoid the use of technical phrases, and, in short, enable any person of ordinary business capacity to see clearly what he is doing when he executes a deed, and even (should he care to take the trouble) enable him to dispense with expert assistance in all but complicated transactions. A number of model forms are contained in the rules, adapted to a considerable variety of cases, and power is also expressly given to alter and add to the forms in any manner that may be necessary in order to carry out the intentions of the parties. In the majority of transactions, where the value of the property disposed of is small, it seems probable that these regulations are adhered to, the statutory forms (altered and added to as occasion requires) being used and no other documents being executed. But it also appears that in an important minority of transactions, especially mortgages, and where the value of the property disposed of is large, deeds of conveyance and mortgage in the old forms are also prepared and executed as well as the statutory transfers and charges, thus increasing the trouble, and sometimes the cost, incident to the transactions themselves, and preparing confusion for the future by creating and maintaining a kind of spurious title, evidenced by deeds outside the register, and tending to perpetuate the old-fashioned system of abstracts of title, with its attendant expense and uncertainty, in a somewhat aggravated form. It is very seldom that one of these documents contains anything that might not just as well have been inserted in the registered instrument which it accompanies. It will easily be seen that a practice under which landowners are asked to execute two deeds in all dealings with registered land, whereas only one is required for unregistered land, is hardly likely to give them a favourable impression of the new system. Another disadvantage of the practice is that it has a tendency to obscure the true issue in various legal proceedings by directing attention to documents of secondary importance instead of to the register where the real pith of the action must eventually be found to lie. Cases have been brought to my notice where foreclosure proceedings were taken on the unregistered mortgage instead of on the registered charge, and their uselessness only became apparent when it was sought to carry the orders made into practical effect. I know of no immediately effective means of putting an end to the inconvenient practice to which I have drawn attention. In cases where additional charges are made for the unnecessary documents the point might be raised on a summons for taxation. But taxation is seldom resorted to in conveyancing matters, and I further believe (for a reason which will appear later—para. 83, p. 18) that in many cases no specific charges are made for the additional deeds. The trouble arises from an apparent inability to recognize the fact that the new forms are quite as efficacious as the old, and as long as this state of mind exists the more cautious practitioners will probably continue to seek safety by continuing the use of both. It is rather in the hope of overcoming this feeling to a certain extent that I have ventured to make these observations.

2. *Retention of Land Certificates by Charge Creditors.*—A good deal of inconvenience and expense to landowners is caused by creditors under registered charges requiring the borrowers to deposit with them their land certificates. It will be remembered that under the non-registration system of conveyancing a mortgagee is obliged to obtain the custody of the mortgagor's title deeds, because otherwise he could not sell the property, and also because if he left them in the mortgagor's hands the latter might conceal the existence of the mortgage on subsequent dealings. But it is a considerable inconvenience to the mortgagor, because on all such dealings he has to send people to the mortgagee to look at the title deeds, and usually must pay his solicitor a fee for producing them. Under the registry system nothing of this kind is necessary. The borrower keeps his land certificate (a note of the charge being indorsed on it) and the creditor has a separate certificate of his own, called a "certificate of charge," containing all information about the charge, and the land comprised in it and all incumbrances (if any), and enabling him to sell the land and deal with the security in any manner he pleases. In order to remove all possible reason for the creditor requiring the land certificate, the charge certificate is made to contain full particulars from the register and of the registered plan of the land charged, the preparation and issue of charge certificates forming a very appreciable proportion of the total work of the department. Production of the land certificate is never required on any transfer of, or other dealing with, the charge, or on any sale, foreclosure, or other mode of enforcement of the security. By these means it was hoped that the landowner would be saved a considerable amount of inconvenience and expense on all subsequent dealings as compared with the old system. In case there should be any doubt about it the Act of 1897 expressly stated that (in the absence of express agreement to the contrary) the creditor should have no right to retain the debtor's land certificate: see section 8, sub-section 4. Unfortunately the conservative habits of the legal profession have hitherto in practice prevented landowners from deriving much benefit from these arrangements. It is not too much to say that the majority of practitioners ignore them altogether, and insist, on behalf of the creditor, that he shall hold not only his own certificate of charge, but (as with title deeds in the old days before the Act) the borrower's land certificate as well. The result of this is that as regards subsequent transactions during the mortgage the borrower is not only not relieved from the disadvantages he suffered under the old system, but suffers them in an aggravated form. For whereas on future transactions under the former system he only had to ask the creditor to allow inspection of his deeds—a comparatively simple matter—

he now has to ask the creditor to produce the land certificate at the Land Registry at a given date, and to leave it there for a few days, while the required official indorsements are being made upon it—a much more serious, and usually more expensive matter—not to mention a good deal of difficulty sometimes in inducing him to take it there at all. Of course it may be asked, why does the borrower allow himself to be treated in this manner? In reply, it seems sufficient to point out that creditors and their solicitors are usually in a position more or less to dictate their own terms. Also, the full extent of the inconvenience is often not appreciated till after the time for resistance has gone by. In a case which I heard of not long ago, where forty leases, each of which had been separately registered, were to be included in one mortgage, the borrower stated that the creditor's solicitor was asking a fee of two guineas for each certificate to be produced—eighty guineas in all. So great does this tax upon the borrowers appear likely to become that it may eventually be necessary (unless the practice modifies itself) to reconsider the whole subject of land and charge certificates. These documents are not by any means a necessary incident of registration of title, though, if reasonably dealt with, they are a great convenience to the landowner and to mortgagees. But according to the custom now prevalent they are converted in many cases (though doubtless unintentionally) into a mere engine of oppression. It is much to be desired that a reasonable practice, in accordance with the clear intention of the Act, may be adopted by general consent and so render it unnecessary to make any new departure in legislation on this subject.

3. *Solicitors' Charges for Dealings with Registered Land.*—It seems that it is not always remembered in preparing bills of costs on sales and mortgages of land already on the register that Schedule I. of the Remuneration Order of 1882 has no application to registered land—not even where the title is possessory—see paragraph 1 of the Remuneration Order itself. As regards absolute title, and, in fact, any case where no title outside the register is investigated—which would include all cases of possessory title where the first registration is taken as the root of title, and also all leasehold titles first entered in the name of the original lessee, of which there are already over 23,000 on the books—a special scale is instituted by the Land Transfer Rules, 1903: see rule 336 (C) (i.) and Schedule II. This scale is 10s. 6d. per £100 up to £1,000 value, and afterwards at lower rates, ending with £26 5s. for values over £80,000. For dealings with land registered with possessory title there is no scale, and charges should be made according to the work actually done: rule 336 (C) (ii.). The effect of this rule is that, as the work to be done gradually diminishes, owing to the operation of the principle explained above (paragraphs 39 and 40, p. 10), the costs will diminish likewise, until, when no investigation outside the register is required, the new scale referred to in the preceding paragraph will apply. The perusal of bills of costs forms no part of the usual work of this department, so I can only speak subject to correction on this point, but so far as I can gather from statements made as to the practice on dealings with possessory title, the system usually in fact adopted is to ignore the rule above referred to, and to charge "scale" costs under Schedule I. of the Remuneration Order of 1882, plus the fees paid in the Land Registry. Of the bills of costs that I happen to have seen, two were prepared in this manner, two according to the rule. The two former exhibited an increase in cost owing to registration, the two latter shewed a reduction. The practice which I am told is the more general seems hardly satisfactory. In the first place, it is not sanctioned by law; next, so long as it is continued it reduces to a nullity the gradual curative effect of the possessory registration explained above (paragraphs 39 and 40, p. 10); and, further, by representing the costs of all dealings as exactly what they would have been before, plus something additional, it hardly gives a correct impression to the public of the general object and tendency of the Land Transfer Acts. If it be thought that an *ad valorem* scale is desirable for the remuneration of solicitors on dealings with possessory title there would be no great difficulty in arranging one. It should begin, for dealings soon after the original registration, at something near the scale of 1882, and should diminish gradually as that event recedes, until in, say, twenty-five years time (after which it may assumed no purchaser would desire to go behind the original registration, which would then be founded on a conveyance on sale twenty-five years old) it would merge in the scale already authorized for cases where no title outside the register is investigated (see above, paragraph 81).

The annual dinner of the Central Criminal Court Bar Mess took place at the Trocadero Restaurant on the 11th inst., when Mr. R. D. Muir presided. A considerable number of the members of the mess attended, and among the guests present were Mr. Justice Bucknill, Mr. Justice Walton, and the Recorder, Sir Forrest Fulton, K.C.

It is officially announced that the Government has decided to appeal in the matter now commonly spoken of as the recent West Riding judgment. This decision is due to the necessity which exists for clearing up, if possible, some of the numerous points of difficulty which have arisen consequentially upon the judgment. It appears that, owing to the particular form of the judgment, local authorities find themselves in great doubt as to whether certain forms of expenditure will or will not now be legal, and several difficult issues are inevitably raised in addition to the one specific point that was alone decided, technically speaking, by the judgment. Both the Board of Education and the Local Government Board have been appealed to by local authorities in all parts of the country for guidance or advice; and, as neither of these departments has any authority to pronounce on the matters in question, local authorities administration is in danger of drifting into chaos, and individual members naturally fear surcharge.

Legal Education.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE GRANT delivered the opening lecture of the session of the department of law and economics at the Technical College, Huddersfield, on the subject of "Legal Education." In the course of his address he said that with regard to schemes of legal education it might be soundly said that "Whatever is best administered is best," remembering that administration is a work not of the teachers only, but of both educators and educated together. Moreover, they must be working to an understood aim, and education from a legal point of view is not satisfied by an equipment of special knowledge, but refers to the moulding or training of the mind and character by habituation until qualities are acquired which befit and mark a good lawyer. Education is a long process. Many men in connection with their calling possess knowledge of its particular laws who could not deal like a competent lawyer with questions on those laws with which they are acquainted. This is the case with sheriff's officers, bankers, inland revenue officials, policemen, money-lenders, and many others. A good lawyer dealing with a legal point, the details of which are within the knowledge of one of those specialists, would argue and reach conclusions in the way that the specialist could not, the reason being that the lawyer is a trained and educated man. The difference lies more in the faculty of his mind than in his general knowledge of all branches of law—his trained faculty teaches him—first, in considering the facts or documents, not to take a part separately from the whole; secondly, to look for the leading factor and give it due weight; thirdly, whether on rules of law or decisions, to consider the principle—the feature that distinguishes a lawyer from a pettifogger; and fourthly, the true lawyer is habituated to exactness and precision in the use of language. In the education of a lawyer details of legal knowledge are important, not primarily for their own sake, but in order to help in building up the lawyer-like capacity of dealing with any material and acquiring any special knowledge or facts as may be needed from time to time. Legal materials, however, being important in this subsidiary way, the lecturer referred to the best practical ways of acquiring positive knowledge both by reading and lectures. With regard to the mode of training the mind, he said that previous general education of boys might greatly assist, mentioning as specially useful mathematical studies and translations from one language to another. The special education, when begun, should include the examination of reported cases, writing out opinions and arguments, drafting documents and criticizing drafts, attending debates or moots and lectures. Lectures could be often most usefully attended without too much use of the note book. With regard to the importance of writing, he quoted a passage from Cicero, who held that, even for orators, no exercise was so valuable as assiduous writing. All these modes of instruction ought to be carried on simultaneously and worked in with one another. After the student has made some progress, the lecturer advised attendance at courts where there were good judges and advocates, and said that the better lawyer a young man already is, the more he can improve and develop by assisting at discussions in court. With regard to rules of procedure and practice, except as to ascertaining some of the leading principles underlying them, they had little educational value. If a law student's education rested, like that of Uriah Heep in David Copperfield, upon a study of Kidd's Practice and eschewing all Latin, there would be some danger of the student blossoming into a lawyer of the character of Uriah Heep. Referring to the training of professional lawyers in matters of conduct, the lecturer said it was the duty of barristers and solicitors who had pupils not only to teach them by example, but also to expressly mention and inculcate particular rules of conduct—for instance, as to secrecy, professional honour, and so forth. For the most part, in matters of conduct as well as of honour, an upright man is naturally more capable than a cunning man; but there is one quality needed by a practising lawyer which an honourable man would hardly learn except by age and experience, and that is an insight into the dispositions of bad and malicious persons and consequent habits of necessary wariness and suspiciousness. Apart from that, the whole of a good lawyer's equipment is more easily acquired in early manhood than in later years. Law students should therefore apply themselves steadily in youth to the study of principles. In youth there is an aptness for acquiring fresh capacity, ways of thought, and customs which afterwards fades. As Bacon said, "Late learners cannot so well take the ply." Passing from the education of lawyers, the lecturer referred to the question, "What share in the education of laymen can usefully be allotted to law?" The notion that the law could be so simplified that every man could be his own lawyer was shown to be chimerical, and the true use of codification was referred to. There was, however, no question that legal education might with benefit be participated in by certain classes of laymen. All educated and business men would find a lawyer-like mind valuable in writing and interpreting documents and in judging and acting for themselves in many situations. The fitness of such a mind for business and affairs was shown by the extent to which chief working positions in the State as well as in great undertakings were committed to lawyers. Moreover, a substantial legal training was essential for those who were to be magistrates or administrators of the law, unless they were to be either puppets or troublemakers. To that extent the universities ought to introduce a certain amount of legal element into the curriculum of their leading general course of studies, whatever it might be. For instance, at the University of Oxford the classical school might include lectures on such matters as the construction of documents and English legal maxims. Jurisprudence in a wider sense he considered no necessary part of professional legal education. To conclude, a modest conception of practical needs with regard to the education of young lawyers might be this—that there should be regular teaching; that the teachers should constantly put forward and

illustrate the place and operation of legal principles in practical and detailed law, and also regularly instruct and exercise their pupils in accurate writing and drafting according as their legal knowledge for the time being admits; and that the learners should be diligent in the painful process of writing, and should not, in the pride of youth, be scornful of lectures, even the dullest. These matters were within their grasp, not only in London, but also the great provincial towns, and attention to them did not exclude an admiring vision of a great university of law to be established in the metropolis, having machinery for training skilled professors and administrators in every system of law known to the Empire, nor a more confident hope and belief that the existing universities may do something more than at present to equip English magistrates and leaders of industry with the best lawyer-like qualities of mind.

Legal News.

Changes in Partnerships. Dissolutions.

HENRY SALAMAN HARRIS and HAROLD HENRY HARRIS, solicitors (H. R. Harris & Co.), 63, Coleman-street, London. July 1.

EDGAR CHRISTMAS HARVIE, HENRY ALLAN ROUGHTON MAX, and EUAN MACLAURIN EUAN-SMITH, solicitors (Minet, Harvie, May, & Co.), 4, King William-street, London. Oct. 10. So far as concerns the said Edgar Christmas Harvie, who retires from the said firm; the said Henry Allan Roughton May and Euan MacLaurin Euan-Smith will continue to carry on the practice, in partnership, at the same address, under the style or firm of Minet, May, & Euan-Smith. [Gazette, Oct. 12.]

Information Required.

Re MATTHEW GIBSON (deceased).—Information required by the undersigned as to the death and grant of probate or administration to the estate of the above, who was an executor of and beneficially interested under the will, dated 7th September, 1792, and proved 5th April, 1795, of John Croger, and was in such will described as "of Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square, Playing Card Manufacturer."—F. Wickings Smith & Son, solicitors, 23, Lincoln's-inn-fields, W.C.

General.

During the course of the election inquiry at Worcester, says the *Globe*, Mr. Tindal Atkinson, K.C., asked a witness whether he would rather be prosecuted or have a certificate, and the gentleman promptly replied that he would rather have a certificate. The question seems about equivalent to asking a man whether he would rather run a mile or have a ride on a tram top.

It is announced that the King has been pleased, by warrants under the Royal Sign Manual, bearing date the 1st inst., to direct letters patent to be passed granting the rank and dignity of counsel to his Majesty to Mr. Neil John Downie Kennedy, Mr. Robert Francis Leslie Blackburn, Mr. John Graham Stewart, and Mr. Thomas Brash Morison, advocates, members of the Scottish bar.

HIS HONOUR JUDGE WOODFALL, on the 11th inst., says the *Evening Standard*, held the last sitting which will take place in the historic buildings in St. Martin's-lane, which has for so many years done duty as the Westminster County Court. The present court was instituted to supersede the old Court of Request, which stood upon the site now occupied by the Garrick Theatre. The building will be taken down, and more commodious premises built.

In drawing attention at Newport to the fact that 1,066 persons in England and Wales were imprisoned in 1905 for not having paid debts they were ordered to pay, Judge Owen said, according to the *Daily Mail*, that the only remedy for this was to make the abolition of imprisonment for debt a reality by getting rid of the power to imprison on judgment summonses. If this power was taken away the system of credit giving by retail tradesmen would go with it. This would be a benefit both to the retail tradesmen and the working men themselves.

Ridley, J., has fixed the following commission days for holding the autumn assizes on the Midland Circuit: Aylesbury, Monday, November 12; Bedford, Wednesday, November 14; Northampton, Friday, November 16; Leicester, Tuesday, November 20; Lincoln, Friday, November 23; Nottingham, Wednesday, November 28; Derby, Saturday, December 1; Warwick, Thursday, December 6; Birmingham, Tuesday, December 11. Mr. Justice Ridley will proceed on the circuit alone until Birmingham is reached, when he will be joined by Mr. Justice Phillimore.

The following resolution, passed by the Criminal Law and Prison Reform Department of the Humanitarian League, has been sent to the Lord Chancellor: "This committee desires to call the attention of the Lord Chancellor to the statement made in the London Press that at the Bow County Court alone over a thousand summonses had been proved during the present year by a debt collector, most of the debts being too small to render it worth the creditors' while to attend in person or to employ a solicitor; and trusts that his lordship will express his strong disapproval of commitments to prison in any case in which the debt has not been proved by the plaintiff in person or by his solicitor."

At the Cumberland Quarter Sessions on Tuesday a letter was read from Mr. J. W. Lowther resigning the office of chairman owing to his duties as Speaker. Mr. Rimington (deputy-chairman) expressed the regret of the justices at losing Mr. Lowther's services; and a resolution was unanimously passed recording the court's appreciation of the admirable manner in which he had presided over the court. Mr. Rimington was elected chairman in his place. The Marquis of Bath was on Tuesday elected chairman of the Wilts Quarter Sessions, in succession to Lord Fitzmaurice, resigned, and Mr. Edward Colston chairman of the second court, in succession to Sir Godfrey Lushington, resigned.

Mr. J. L. Purves, K.C., of Lincoln's-inn, the leader of the Melbourne Bar, says the *Daily Chronicle*, learnt boxing at a saloon in Oxford-street, as well as law in Chancery-lane. He reported the famous fight between Heenan and Sayers for a London paper, and after nearly half a century his interest in the noble art is unabated. He was present the other evening at a boxing match in a Melbourne amphitheatre between the champion of Australia and a visiting bruiser who claimed to be the champion of England, Ireland, and South Africa, and was defeated. Addressing the crowded audience in reference to projected legislation for the suppression of public boxing matches, Mr. Purves declared that boxing developed three of the finest qualities of the British race—courage, fortitude, and patience. "Britain is at the head of the nations," cried Mr. Purves, in a patriotic outburst, "not only on account of her armaments, but by virtue of the invincible spirit of her people."

On the occasion of the re-opening of the Law Courts a special service will be held at Westminster Abbey, at 11.45 a.m., which the Lord Chancellor and his Majesty's judges will attend. In order to ascertain what space will be required, members of the junior bar wishing to be present are requested to send their names, on or before Monday, the 22nd of October, to the Secretary of the General Council of the Bar, 2, Hare-court, Temple, E.C. Barristers attending the service must wear robes. Those who are doctors of the civil law or doctors of laws, and practice as such in the Ecclesiastical, Admiralty, and Probate Courts, may wear their academic gowns. All should be at the Jerusalem Chamber, Westminster Abbey (Dean's-yard entrance), where robing accommodation will be provided, not later than 11.30 a.m. A limited number of seats in the South Transept will be reserved for friends of members of the bar, to whom one ticket of admission (or, if possible, two) will be issued on application to the Secretary of the General Council of the Bar, on or before Monday, the 22nd of October. No tickets are required for admission to the North Transept, which is open to the public.

TO EXECUTORS.—VALUATIONS FOR PROBATE.—Messrs. Watherston & Son, Jewellers, Goldsmiths, and Silversmiths to H.M. The King, 6, Vigo-street (leading from Regent-street to Burlington-gardens and Bond-street), London, W., Value, Purchase, or Arrange Collections of Plate or Jewels for Family Distribution, late of Pall Mall East, adjoining the National Gallery.—[ADVT.]

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON				
Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice KEEBLE.	Mr. Justice BUCKLEY.
Wednesday, Oct. 24	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Goldschmidt	Mr. Grosvenor	Mr. Godfrey
Thursday	Godfrey	Theod	W. Leach	Farmer
Friday	Beal	Goldschmidt	Grosvenor	Godfrey
Saturday	R. Leach	Theod	W. Leach	Farmer
Date	Mr. Justice JONES.	Mr. Justice SWINFER EADY.	Mr. Justice WARRINGTON.	Mr. Justice NEVILLE.
Wednesday, Oct. 24	Mr. Church	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. R. Leach	Mr. King
Thursday	King	Carrington	Beal	Church
Friday	Church	Pemberton	R. Leach	W. Leach
Saturday	King	Carrington	Beal	Grosvenor

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—Friday, Oct. 12.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ANGLO-WESTRALIAN DEVELOPMENT SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 12, to send in their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to John Douglas Stewart Bogle, 3, Gt St Helens

BLUE STAR LINE, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 1, to send their names and addresses, with full particulars of their debts or claims, to John Carlisle, 4, St Mary Axe

DARLINGTON WAGON AND ENGINEERING CO, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 22, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George Bennett Netherwood, Royal Exchange, Middlesbrough Lucas & Co, Middlesbrough, solvers to the liquidator

DEEP LEADS ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION CO, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Oct 3, directed to be heard Oct 30. Birkbeck & Co, Copthall av, solvers for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

HULL AND DISTRICT BUILDERS' ACCIDENT INSURANCE CO, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 29, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edgar Wilfrid Shaw, 22, Silver st, Kingston upon Hull

HUXLEY BREWERY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 12, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Matthew Edmund Ames, 63, Wool exchange, Coleman st. Godwin & Son, solvers for liquidator

KINGSTON RAILWAY WAGON CO, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Craik, 3, Parliament st, Kingston upon Hull. Pearlman, solvers for liquidator

PETERS & BRIDGES, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Aug 11, directed to be heard Oct 30. Fritchard & Co, Painters' Hall, Little Trinity in, solvers for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

REPORTERS PRESS AGENCY, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts and claims, to B T Crew, 1, George st West, Luton

ROYAL HOTEL (VENTNOR), LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Oct 10, directed to be heard at the Town Hall, Newport, Oct 24. Urry & Co, Ventnor, I.W. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 23

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Oct. 16.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

BRITISH EMPIRE SOAP CO, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Sept 4, directed to be heard Oct 30. Rawlings & Butt, Walbrook, solvers for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

CHARLES, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Oct 5, directed to be heard Oct 30. Gover & Co, Queen st, Chesapeake, solvers for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

CROWBROUGH SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 24, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their claims, to Reginald Bernard Petre, 11, Ironmonger lane. Nuttall, Old Jewry chmbrs, solvers

FLEETWOOD & CALVERT, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 31, to send their debts or claims to Harold Alphonsus Deakin, Talbot chmbrs, Talbot square, Blackpool

GEORGE RIDDEL & CO, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J M Lawson, Globe chmbrs, Newcastle on Tyne

JOHNSON'S SACCHARINE CO, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to J C O'Neill, 161, Palmerston house, Old Broad st. Wilson & Co, Copthall bldgs, solvers for liquidators

LOTHBURY INVESTMENT SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to E A N Morley, 10, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st

NO 2 PEAT COAL SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Oct 8, directed to be heard Oct 30. Phillips & Co, Cannon st, solvers for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

UNIVERSAL BAKAR CO, LIMITED.—Ptn for winding up, presented Oct 12, directed to be heard Oct 30. Baker & Co, Gresham st, solvers for ptners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 29

The Property Mart.

Result of Sale.

REVERSIONS, LIFE POLICIES, AND SHARES.

Messrs. H. E. Foster & Cranfield held their usual Fortnightly Sale (No. 521) of the above-named interests at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on Thursday last, when the following Lots were sold at the prices named, the total amount realized being £3,961:—

REVERSION TO £7,271 11s. 7d.	Sold £3,960
POLICIES OF ASSURANCE:					
For £25,500	1,330
For £22,000	935
For £2500	220
For £500	150
ENDOWMENT POLICY for £100	76

Creditors' Notices.

Under Estates in Chancery.

London Gazette.—Friday, Oct. 12.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

GADDUM, CHARLES EDWARD WAITMAN, Montford, Altrincham Nov 12 Gaddum v Gaddum, Registrar, Manchester Lord, Manchester

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—Friday, Sept. 28.

ALLCHURCH, THOMAS INOX, Arlington sq, Islington, Foreman Coppersmith Oct 31 Sewell, Croom's hill, Greenwich

ANDREWS, CHARLES, Farnham Nov 1 Holloet & Co, Farnham

ASHLIN, WILLIAM CROMPTON, Cloughton, Birkhead Oct 30 Hoeking, Liverpool

AUSTRIAL, GEORGE, Dorchester Oct 30 Perkins & Hind, Bradford

AUSTIN, SAMUEL, Southsea, Hants Oct 29 Robinson, Southsea

BAGGS, SAMUEL, Gt Yarmouth Nov 9 Wiltshire & Sons, Gt Yarmouth

BATLIS, EMILY, Park rd, Regent's Park Oct 23 Stephens & Sons, Somerset st, Portman sq

BLANCHFLOWER, JAMES, Stalybridge, Chester, Cotton Operative Oct 31 Buckley & Co, Stalybridge

BRACE, ELIZABETH ANN PARKER, Fulham Oct 27 McIntyre & Capel-Peters, Birkbeck Bank chmbrs, Holborn

CAIRNS, MARGARET ANN, Newcastle on Tyne Oct 31 Ord, Gateshead

COSTER, WILLIAM, Beulah rd, Thornton Heath Oct 31 Pugh & Simpson, Budge row

CRAIGIE, PEARL MARY TERESA, Ventnor Oct 31 Knapp-Fisher & Sons, Buckingham gate, Westminster

CYRUS, THOMAS, Harlow, Essex Oct 25 Millar & Sons, St Thomas st, London Bridge

DALIELL, CAROLINE MARGARET LEIGH, Wallingford Nov 1 Hedges & Marshall, Wallingford, Berks

DAVIES, ISABEL ELIZABETH, Richmond rd, Earl's Court Oct 25 Taylor & Co, Strand

DAVIS, EDWIN, Thornton Heath Nov 9 Barrow, Railway gate, London Bridge

DEWSEY, LUCY, Mossley, Yorks Oct 31 Lawton, Mossley

EDWARDS, JAMES, Gobowen, Whittington, Salop, Brewer Nov 30 Minshalls & Co, Oswestry

GHILDARD, MARIAN GIBSON, Whalley Range, Withington, Manchester Nov 1 Buck & Co, Southport

GODFREY, WILLIAM WOOLFIT, Navenby, Lincs, Farmer Nov 15 Turnbee & Co, Lincoln

GREENHILL, HARRIOT, Bexley Heath Oct 30 Barnard, Westminster Bridge rd

HAWKSWORTH, FRANCIS MARY HENRIETTA, Swagmoor Nov 3 Bone, Bourne-mouth

HOLLOWAY, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Bath Dec 31 Chesterton, Bath

HUTCHINSON, JOYCE, York Nov 1 E J & A Puters, York

JAMES, SAMUEL, Pilkington rd, Peckham Oct 13 Jago, Plymouth

KING, ALFRED MURRELLS, Putney, Baker Nov 2 Gascoigne & Fowler, York bldgs, Adelphi

KLINGENDER JULIA, Iver, Bucks Oct 29 Smith, Frenchchurch bldgs

KYNOCH, GEORGE COLLINGWOOD, Bushey, Herts Nov 12 Reid, Gt St Helens

LEA, ELLEN, Seaforth, Lancs Oct 15 Tebbay & Lynch, Liverpool

McDONALD, JAMES, Surbiton Oct 26 Rimer, Surbiton
MIDDLETON, THOMAS HERBERT, Middle Tysoe, Warwick, Farmer Oct 29 Fairfax, Banbury
MORRICE, GEORGE, Rockbourne, Southampton, Yeoman Nov 1 Jackson & Co, Fording-
bridge, Hants
MORTON, ALFRED, Marsh, Huddersfield Nov 1 Sykes, Huddersfield
NAYLOR, ELIZABETH, Isworth, Bury St Edmunds Nov 1 Saxton & Morgan, Somerset st,
Portland
OLDFIELD, FREDERICK, Eocles, Lancs Nov 5 Watson, Manchester
PETERS, JOHN WILLIAM, Aspinde, rd, Rotherhithe, Lighterman Oct 31 Sewell, Crooms
hill, Greenwich
SKEATH, ELIZABETH, Surbiton Nov 30 Wilkinson & Co, Kingston on Thames
SPACCATI, SETTIMA, Tiebhorst st Oct 31 Baker & Co, Abchurch la
SPACKY, MARY, Warrington, Oxford Oct 29 Fairfax, Banbury
STONES, SARAH, Hanley Nov 5 Paddock & Sons, Hanley
TAYLOR, JOSEPH, Hinton Green, Oldland, Bilton, Glos Nov 30 Taylor, Thornbury, Glos
TETLOW, JOHN RICHARD, R ck Ferry, Chester Oct 15 Tyer & Co, Liverpool
TOOLE, JOHN LAWRENCE, Maida Vale, Comedian Nov 30 Dubois & Co, Pancras ln,
Queen st
WARDLE, THOMAS KIRBY, Lacey, Lincs Nov 1 Wainwright, Gt Grimaby
WHITAKER, WILLIAM, Breckmore, nr Ripon Dec 1 Wise & Son, Ripon
WISKEWORTH, ELLEN, Enfield Highway Oct 31 Cameron & Co, Old Broad st
WOOD, EDWARD JOHN, Gainsborough, Engineer Oct 27 Sower, Brigg

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 2.

ARMITAGE, JOSEPH, Greenfield, Yorks, Surveyor Oct 31 Buckley & Co, Stalybridge
BENNETT, JOHN CUSTANCE, Lithord, Hempstead Oct 30 Bryson & Wells, Lawrence ln,
Chesapeake
BOOTHMAN, MARIA, Skipton, Yorks Oct 30 Knowles, Skipton
BOOTHMAN, WILLIAM, Skipton, Yorks, Butcher Oct 30 Knowles, Skipton
CHARLTON, RALPH, Rotherham, Yorks Oct 27 Gichard, Rotherham
COOK, BENARD, Rose Mount, Birkenhead, Wool Broker Nov 17 Masters & Rogers,
Liverpool
CURTIS, THOMAS, Richmond, Surrey, Greengrocer Oct 31 Senior & Furbank, Richmond
DALE, THOMAS VINCENT, Worcester, Estate Agent Nov 1 Beauchamp & Gallaher,
Worcester
EAST, ARTHUR, Baines, Wholesale Stationer Oct 31 Spencer & Co, Queen st
ELLIOT, WILLIAM MURKETT, Swainsthorpe, Norfolk Oct 31 Stevens & Co, Norwich
GARLAND, GEORGE JAMES, Green Lanes, Middlesex, Licensed Victualler Oct 24 Robins &
Clark, Hovey
GASTON, WILLIAM, Golborne, Lancs Nov 1 Smith, Wigan
GLADWELL, ALFRED THOMAS, Eastcheap, Printseller Nov 1 Howse & Etc, Salter's Hall
ct, Chesham
HALL, WALTER, Waltham Cross Nov 12 Letts Bros, Bartlett's bldgs
HALLSTAD, MARY, Broadbottom, Chester Oct 31 Buckley & Co, Stalybridge
HARRIS, WILLIAM, Fatchley Bridge, Yorks Oct 30 Kirby & Son, Harrogate
HELLMANN, WILLIAM, Blenheim Crescent, Ladbroke grove Dec 25 Peddar, Old Broad st
HOLLINGSWORTH, HEDLEY CRYST, Brixton rd, Stock and Share Broker Oct 30 Durant,
Guildhall chambers
HOWLEY, THOMAS, Habbrough, Lincs, Cottager Oct 23 Waite & Co, Boston
HOOKS, HARRY DE LA, Brighton Nov 12 Bush, Brighton
HORDEN, JOHN, Lee, N Devon Oct 31 Sarah Mortimer-Booth, Foxcombe Hill, nr Oxford
IMRI, WILLIAM, Liverpool Nov 3 Whittins, Liverpool
INGRAM, HENRIETTA, New Cross rd Nov 12 Bolton & Co, Temple gds, Temple
JAYE, ELIZABETH, Rugby Oct 23 Watkiss & Thompson, Rugby
KESTON, WILLIAM, Oldham, Coal Dealer Oct 30 Lees, Oldham
KERRAW, JOSEPH, Heights Delph, Yorks, Innkeeper Oct 30 Lees, Oldham
LEIGHTON, SAMUEL MARTIN, Cambridge, Draper Nov 10 Ginn & Co, Cambridge
LOGGINS, FREDERICK, Manchester, Beerhouse Keeper Oct 27 Pearson, Manchester
MATTHEWS, ANN, Rugby Oct 26 Watkiss & Thompson, Rugby
PASS, ALFRED HENRY, Northaw, Herts Oct 31 Griffiths, St Bride's av, Fleet st
PATRICK, ZACHARIAS, Harley, Salop, Farmer Nov 10 Cantano & Elliott, Wellington,
Salop
RANDLES, CAROLINE, Andelf, Liverpool Nov 3 Pritchard, Barry Dock
REUPE, MARY, Unthank, Langworthy, Cumberland Oct 31 Little & Lamony, Penrith
REYTON, AUBREY GOUCH, Beckenham Nov 12 Nicholson & Co, Princes st, Storey's gate
ROBSON, MARY ANN JANE, Waterloo, Lancs Nov 1 Watson & Atkinson, Liverpool
RUBS, SALLY ELIZABETH, Barnstable Oct 29 Finch & Chanter, Barnstable
RYDER, SYDNEY WOOD, Middlesex, nr Patchley Bridge, Yorks, Hotel Proprietor Oct 30
Kirby & Son, Harrogate
SAUNDERS, CLIFFORD JAMES, Folkestone, Draper Nov 13 Hall, Folkestone
SAXTON, JAMES, Morley, Yorks, Oil Extractor Nov 9 Brearley & Son, Batley
SHIRKEFF, WILLIAM, Jodah Zemindary, Jessore, Bengal, India, Indigo Planter Nov 14
Holmes & Co, Clements ln, Lombard st
SIMPSON, EMILY, Bassett, Southampton Nov 9 Moberly & Wharton, Southampton
SPRING, ALICE, Liverpool Nov 2 Evans & Co, Liverpool
STOTARD, WILLIAM JENSON, West Didsbury, Manchester, Physician Nov 10 J & E
Whitworth, Manchester
TAYLOR, CHARLES HENRY, Derby Nov 1 Attenborough, Piccadilly
THREPLINGTON, WILLIAM, Armlay, Leeds, Commercial Traveller Nov 2 Haigh, Leeds
WALLIS, ALICE, Kingsdown, nr Dover Nov 12 Peacock & Co, Field ct, Gray's inn
WILSON, JOHN, Ekeington, Derby, Wood Turner Oct 30 Alderson & Co, Sheffield

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 5.

ABSON, ERNEST, West Hampstead Nov 2 Tatham & Co, Queen Victoria st
ALBERT, PETER, Rock, nr Bentley, Builder Nov 29 Marcy & Co, Bewdley
ASNEY, CHARITY, Uckfield Nov 1 Hillman, Lewes
BARKER, LAURA RAYMOND, Cranley, pl, South Kensington Nov 30 Wade & Lyall,
Bishopsgate st Within
BARNES-WILLIAMS, THOMAS, Piccadilly, Architect Nov 10 Cops & Co, Victoria st
BLACKWOOD, ARTHUR, Liverpool, Physician Nov 5 Hagger, Liverpool
BOLNET, EDWARD WILLIAM, Swanscombe Nov 1 Robinson & Co, Swanscombe
BOVELL, JAMES, Ravensdown st, Kemington rd Oct 30 Drewry & Co, Burton on Trent
CROOK, BRADSHAW, Bootle, Lancs Nov 5 Hagger, Liverpool
DALE, CHARLES WILLIAM, Middlesbrough, Joiner Nov 3 Punch & Robson, Middles-
brough
DIX, JAMES, Cambridge rd, Mile End, Iron Safe Manufacturer Nov 5 Arnold, Old Jewry
DUNN, ZEPH, Sparkhill, Worcester Nov 4 Rabbett, Birmingham
EMBLEY, JOSEPH, Elgin, Illinois, USA Nov 10 Perks, Victoria Embankment
FOX, WILLIAM FRANCIS, East Bridgford Hall, Notts, Lace Manufacturer Nov 26 Watson
& Co, Nottingham
HOGUE, MARIA, Coventry, Jeweller Oct 30 Browette, Coventry
JENNIS, WILLIAM, Fife, Glasgow Nov 2 Hughes & Lewis, Bridgend
LUTTS, ANN, Wickham Nov 5 Fellatt & Fellatt, Banbury
MAGNAN, SAMUEL CUNLIFFE, First Baron Masham, Yorks Nov 9 Mumford & Co, Bradford
NEWBOULT, WILLIAM, Carlton on Trent, Notts, Farmer Nov 1 Larken & Co, Newark on
Trent
NORTHWOOD, SARAH ELLEN, Leeds Oct 15 Boulton & Co, Leeds
ROSE, ARTHUR WASHINGTON, Marston rd, Kensington Dec 31 Colville, Old Jewry
RUSSELL, ROSALD, Earl of Leven and Melville, Bournemouth Nov 30 Lee & Pemberton,
Lincoln's inn fields
SEBASTIAN, EDWARD, Longridge, Lancs Nov 7 Marston, Longridge
SLADE, CONSTANCE, Essex Nov 9 Mumford & Co, Bradford
SMITH, ELIZABETH NOBLE, Queen Anne st, Cavendish sq Nov 16 Goss & Co, London wall
SQUIRE, NOAH, Newham Croft, Cambridge Nov 1 King, Cambridge
STANFORD, HARRY, Woolton, nr Canterbury, Carpenter Nov 12 Bradley, Dover
STOTT, ELLEN HOWARD, Rochdale Nov 11 Chadwick, Rochdale
TAYLOR, WILLIAM HENRY, St Thomas rd, Finsbury Park Nov 30 Wedlake, Finsbury
Park
WALTON, KATHARINE AUGUSTA, Malvern Nov 7 Sanders, King William st

WHITTAKER, WHITWORTH, Oldham, Builder Nov 5 Booth & Sons, Oldham
WOOLLEY, JAMES, Garforth, Yorks, Brick Manufacturer Nov 19 Harland & Isgham
Leeds
WORREY, FREDERICK, Cheltenham Nov 5 Drewry & Co, Burton on Trent

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 9.

APPLEBY, ANDREW, North Shields Nov 11 Duncan, North Shields
APPLEBY, RICHARD, Wythall Heath, nr Alvechurch, Worcester, General Dealer Nov 19
King & Mills, Birmingham
BARTON, ROBERT, Kendal rd, Clapham, Messenger Nov 5 Robinson, Gt Marlborough st
BEALE, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Millwright Nov 17 Branson & Son, Sheffield
BRATTAN, MARGARET, Howell, Chester Oct 25 Day, Liverpool
BREHETON, WILLIAM ROBERT, Kildare, Ireland Nov 15 Smith & Son, Old Broad st
CATTERALL, ANN, Salford, Lancs Nov 10 Briggs & Cross, Manchester
DAVIES, FRANCIS MACDONOUGH, Southsea Nov 10 Pittfield, Petworth
DYKE, THOMAS, JP, Clifton, Glos Nov 5 Lee & Pemberton, Lincoln's inn fields
DYSON, HENRY, Leeds, Insurance Agent Dec 1 Bulmer & Co, Leeds
EDWARDS, HAROLD WILLIAM, Eynham, Oxon Nov 7 Powell & Skues, Essex st, Strand
HARRIS, WILLIAM, Little Wellbeck st, Cavendish sq Oct 31 Oppenheimer & Southern,
St Swithun's ln
HARRISON, ROBERT, Newbiggin by the Sea, Northumberland Nov 5 Charlton, Newcastle
upon Tyne
HEPSTERNALL, WILLIAM, sen, Birmingham, Plumber Nov 30 Clarke & Co, Birmingham
HEPSTERNALL, RICHARD EVERES, Darrington, Yorks, Innkeeper Nov 6 Leatham & Co,
Pontefract
HILL, ALFRED, Hornchurch, Essex, Baker Nov 20 Hunt & Hunt, Romford
HOWARTH, WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE, Waterloo, Lancs Nov 23 Masters & Rogers, Liver-
pool
IRELAND, ELEANOR HOWLETT, North Walsham, Norfolk Nov 20 Cosens-Hardy & Jewell,
Norwich
KNOTT, FREDERICK ALFONSO, Leo, Kent Nov 23 Stuttford, St Helen's pl
LAING, ALEXANDER, Newcastle on Tyne, Wine and Spirit Merchant Nov 11 Duncan,
North Shields
LAWSON, MARY ANN, Hildenborough, Kent Nov 9 J H & J Y Johnson, Lincoln's inn
fields
LEWIS, HANNAH, Acton Nov 8 Engall & Crane, Acton
LEWIS, JANE CATHARINE, Mon Nov 8 Evans, Newport, Mon
LINDLEY, WILLIAM CLAYTON, Arnsley, Leeds Oct 28 Milner, Leeds
MCLEWEN, HELEN, Charles sq, Berkeley sq Nov 5 Rawle & Co, Bedford row
MAKINSON, DANIEL, Leigh, Lancs Nov 6 Marsh & Co, Leigh, Lancs
MITCHELL, FRANK DUNSCOMB, Woodbury, Devon Nov 7 Friend & Tarbet, Exeter
MOSS, ANN, Kempsey, Worcester Nov 1 Beauchamp & Gallaher, Worcester
RAVESHORE, ALICE ANN, Aughton, Lancs Nov 15 Hime & Lamb, Ormskirk
RICHES, GEORGINA, Jarvis Brook, Sussex Nov 6 Parker & Hollebone, Finsbury sq
SWALE, THOMAS, Pontefract Nov 6 Leatham & Co, Pontefract
TAYLOR, MARY ALICE, Dartford Nov 21 Standing & Co, Rochdale
TENKANT, SIR CHARLES, Grosvenor sq Nov 12 Williamson & Co, Sherborne ln, King
William st
TINGLE, GEORGE, Hillsborough, Sheffield Nov 17 Branson & Son, Sheffield
WEBSTER, JOHN, Wavertree, Liverpool, Horticultural Builder Nov 5 Evans & Co,
Liverpool
WHITWORTH, JAMES, Rochdale, Mechanic Nov 3 Wiles & Thompson, Rochdale

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 12.

ALLEN, ANNE, Rhyl, Flint Nov 1 Porter & Co, Colwyn Bay
ALLEN, THOMAS NATHANIEL, Hampton in Arden Oct 23 Shakespeare & Co, Birmingham
BARKER, EMANUEL, Ilkerton, Derby, Licensed Victualler Nov 1 Huliah & Robinson,
Ilkerton, S O, Derby
BEDDOE, THOMAS RUSSELL, Clacton on Sea, Engineer Nov 19 Wynne-Baxter & Keeble,
Lawrence Pountney hill, Cannon st
BOYNTON, AGNES, Leeds Dec 5 Wilkinson & Garland, Leeds
BRATTON, PHILIP WATSON, Tunbridge Wells Nov 22 Allen & Son, Carlisle &
Soho sq
BROWN, MARY, Eaton sq, Housekeeper Nov 2 Watkins, Newtown, N Wales
BAYDON, ESTHER, Hushwaite, nr Easingwold, Yorks Nov 12 Brydon, Liverpool
BULL, EDWARD ALFRED KING, Clifton, Bristol Dec 12 Benson & Co, Bristol
BURTON, JOHN WILLIAM, Whitecross st, Packing Case Manufacturer Nov 20 Moodie &
Son, Basinghall av
CARE, JOHN, Woodstock rd, Shepherd's Bush Nov 12 Howard & Son, Gray's inn sq
CHAPMAN, ROY WILLIAM, East, Eastbourne Dec 31 Wynne-Baxter & Keeble, Lawren-
ce Pountney hill, Cannon st
CUTTS, FREDERICK JOHN, Waterloo, Lancs, Estate Agent Oct 30 Teesay & Lyall,
Liverpool
DALLER, MARY, Folkestone Nov 16 Mowll & Mowll, Dover
DAVIS, REV JOHN, Gabalfa, Glam Nov 19 Bradley & Son, Cardiff
FITTE, PIERRE PAUL, Wellington ct, Knightsbridge, Polish Manufacturer Nov 8
Hands, Gresham st
FLOAG, CASANDER DAVIS, Saint Mary's, Scilly Islands Nov 9 Hill, Penzance
FORD, EDWARD, Leicester Nov 12 Stevenson & Son, Leicester
GARD, WILLIAM SNOWDON, Rosalya hill, Hampstead Dec 1 Gard & Co, Basinghall st
GEM, EDWARD, Lower Wick, Worcester Nov 12 Gem & Co, Birmingham
GINGELL, DANIEL JAMES, Moreton, Essex, Farmer Nov 1 Bond, Ongar, Essex
GREEN, MARY, Kidwink, Yorks Nov 24 Woodcock & Sons, Bury
HARRINGTON, EMILY OCTAVIA, Kensington bath Nov 10 Loughborough & Co, Annis
Friars
HEDDOCK, CAROLINE ESTHER, Caversham rd, Kentish Town Nov 12 Robins & Co,
Lincoln's inn fields
HELLERWELL, FRED, Newlay, Yorks, Dyer Nov 30 Bowling & Sons, Leeds
HENDER, ANN, Queen Charlton, nr Keynham, Somerset Nov 18 Stone & Co, Bath
HIRST, THOMAS JOHN, Drakefield rd, Upper Tooting, Clerk Nov 15 A T G Hirst,
Arods rd, Brixton Hill
HODGELL, WILLIAM, Hollington, Sussex Nov 23 Chubb & Pettitt, New ct, Lincoln's inn
HORTON, HARRIETT, Boston, Lincs Oct 31 Waite & Co, Boston
HOUSELOW, THOMAS, Banbury Nov 11 Apin & Co, Banbury
JAMES, JANE, Walsall Dec 11 Bill, Walsall
JARETT, HENRY, New Romney, Kent Nov 15 Bannan, New Romney
KELLY, MARIA GEORGINA, Southsea Nov 6 Woodbridge & Son, Winchester
KING, JOHN, Bedford Nov 24 Smith, Sandy
MOORE, JOHN, Knightbridge st Nov 17 Godden & Co, Old Jewry
OXLEY, ANN, Weybridge Nov 17 Bromhead & Co, Sheffield
POLKEY, CHRISTIANA, Burton on Trent, Shopkeeper Nov 12 Taylor, Burton on Trent
POPE, CLARA, Clifton, Bristol Nov 6 Woodbridge & Son, Winchester
RAW, ROBERT, Kirkby Malzeard, nr Ripon, York, Grocer Dec 1 Wise & Son, Ripon
RAYNER, JOHN, Boyce Park, Middlesex Nov 20 Moodie & Son, Basinghall av
RICARDE-SKATES, MAJOR FRANCIS IGNATIUS, Fall Mall Nov 19 Braunstein & Skates
Norfolk st, Strand
ROSE, FRANK CHADWICK, Northern Etchells, Chester Nov 17 Smith & Co, Stockport
ROUTLEDGE, SARAH, Newcastle upon Tyne Nov 21 Brown, jun, Newcastle upon Tyne
ROWLAND, JOHN WILLIAM, Fisktoft, Lincs, Farmer Nov 1 Benjamin Rowland, Fisktoft
SARIN, JAMES, Bodicote, Oxford Nov 11 Bennett, Banbury
SHORT, GEORGE, Stapleford, Cambridge Nov 26 Tyler, Clement's lan
SILK, MARY ANN, Essex Nov 20 Palmer, Brighton
SINGLER, JOHN HENRY, Jernyn st, St James's, Hotel Proprietor Nov 12 Routh & Co,
Southampton st, Bloomsbury
SIERR, SAMUEL, Fufford rd, Kennal Rise Nov 2 Britton, Soho sq
SLATER, HANNAH, Royston, nr Barnsley, Yorks Nov 12 Bailey & Sons, Barnsley
SMITH, JOHN THOMAS, St Leonard's on Sea Nov 24 Price & Sons, Walsbrook
SPOKES, RUSSELL, Brighton Nov 26 Radford & Frankland, Chancery ln
STUCKEY, JAMES, Bath Nov 18 Stone & Co, Bath
STRES, LEWIS LEVING, Lindley, Huddersfield, Hosiery Nov 10 Sykes, Huddersfield

THORNTON, JOHN RICHARDS, Paul, Cornwall, Builder Nov 17 Thomas, Penzance
 VABET, JAMES, Clitheroe, Lancs, Yeoman Dec 1 Baldwin & Co, Clitheroe
 WALKER, JOHN, Kingwinford, Staffs Nov 10 Cochran & Macpherson, Aberdeen
 WALKER, SAMUEL, Hoyland Common, Yorks, Ironstone Miner Nov 12 Raley & Sons,
 Barnsley
 WILLIAMS, WILLIAM JOSEPH, Bath, Doctor Nov 12 Michell, Wellington
 WITTE, HERBERT ABERNETHY, West Hampton Nov 12 Tatham & Co, Queen Victoria st
 WOOD, SAMUEL, Edgley, Leekport, Draper Nov 15 H J Fletcher, Hazel Grove

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 16.

BALL, JOHN, Royston, nr Barnsley Dec 12 Raley & Sons, Barnsley
 BELL, MARK SEVER, VC, CB, Windlesham, Berks Dec 8 Bell, Bedford st, Covent garden
 BIGGIN, BERNARD, Sheffield, Tool Manufacturer Nov 31 Slater, Sheffield
 BROOKS, GEORGE, Miffield Nov 15 Ivesson & Macaulay, Heckmondwike
 BROOKS, GEORGE, Sutton, Surrey, Barrister at Law Dec 1 Payne, Budge row, Cannon st
 BROWN, SAMUEL, Chilwell, Notts Nov 1 Fox & Manning, Nottingham
 CARRISON, JOHN, Liverpool, Doctor Dec 1 Thornley & Cameron, Liverpool
 CLAY, JAMES ELKANOR, Cloughton, Chester Nov 16 Garnett, Liverpool
 CLAY, WILLIAM, Clifton Park, Birkenhead, Engineer Nov 16 Garnett, Liverpool
 CROSS, RACHEL ROBINSON, Scarborough Dec 31 Cook & Fowler, Scarborough
 DAINTY, JOHN, Wigan Nov 1 Hope & Garstang, Wigan
 DAVIES, DAVID, Llanfairfawc, Carnarvon Nov 30 Williams, Bangor
 DAY, ELLIS MARGARET, Kestley, nr Wellington, Salop Nov 15 Dean, Wellington, Salop
 ELLIS, BESSIE LOUISE, Bristol Nov 30 Tait & Sons, Bristol
 FENNET, JOHN, Berkswell, Warwick, Newspaper Proprietor Dec 31 Lee & Co, Bir-
 mingham
 FLETCHER, THOMAS, Burnley, Boatman Nov 1 Holmes & Holmes, Burnley
 GREEN, ELIZABETH ANN, Bourne-mouth Dec 30 Meade-King & Sons, Bristol
 HARWOOD, SIR JOHN JAMES, Higher Broughton, Salford Nov 27 Brett & Co, Manchester
 HOBBS, SARAH, Norton Woodseats, Sheffield Dec 4 Bennett, Sheffield
 HUGHES, HENRY, Horne, Surrey, Farmer Nov 15 Turner, East Grinstead
 LOWE, ROBERT, Brightwell, Lanes, Head Manufacturer Nov 24 Haslam, Bolton
 LOVE, JULIA, Cranleigh Nov 19 Letts Brothers, Bartlett's bldgs
 LUDLOW, EDMUND SAMUEL, Bourne-mouth West Nov 16 Lawrence, Essex st, Strand

MARRIAGE, FRANCES ANN, Edgbaston, Birmingham Nov 17 Bradley & Cuthbertson,
 Birmingham
 MARSH, HENRY, Crumppall, Manchester, Weighing Machine Manufacturer Nov 10
 Field & Cunningham, Manchester
 MUSE, JAMES, Stetchworth, Cambridge, Butcher Dec 31 Button & Aylmer, Newmarket
 NEVE, THOMAS, Sandhurst, Hawkhurst, Kent Nov 1 Neve, Stissinghurst, Cranbrook
 NICHOLSON, JEREMIAH, Dalton in Furness, Husbandman Nov 10 Tyson, Dalton in
 Furness
 OLLARD, ARTHUR RIDGWAY, Wisbech St Peter, Isle of Ely, Cambridge, Solicitor Nov 13
 Oldman & Co, Old Serjeants' inn, Chancery in
 PARKINSON, RICHARD THOMAS, Manchester, Doctor Nov 14 Walker & Co, Manchester
 PETER, HON FREDERICK CHARLES EDMUND, Brentwood Nov 19 Few & Co, Surrey st,
 Strand
 PRAGGELL, KATE, Brompton sq Nov 13 Guscotte & Co, Essex st, Strand
 RAPHALL, GEORGE CHARLES, Castle Hill, Englefield Green, Surrey Dec 1 Sydney,
 Highbury point
 REEVE-TUCKER, Major WILLIAM REEVE, Eastbourne Nov 30 Biggs & Co, Eastbourne
 ROGERS, HENRY EDWIN, St Leonards on Sea, Sussex, Grocer Nov 20 King & Hughes,
 Maidstone
 ROSSER, VIAN, Cardiff Nov 16 Stephens, Cardiff
 SCHREIBER, ROSA ALEXANDRA, Hacheston, Suffolk Nov 6 Josselyn & Sons, Ipswich
 SINCLAIR, MIRIAM, Wallasey, Chester Nov 15 Mather & Son, Liverpool
 SMITHSON, CHRISTOPHER, Heckmondwike Nov 15 Ivesson & Macaulay, Heckmondwike
 SPENCER, WILLIAM, Burnley, Clogger Nov 1 Holmes & Holmes, Burnley
 SPITZEL, LOUIS, Ipswich ter, Bayswater, Merchant Nov 30 Abrahams & Co, Token-
 house yard, Lothbury
 TALBOT, ROBERT BERNARD, Seven Kings, Essex Nov 12 Haslett, Queen Victoria st
 TATTERSALL, FRANK OLIVER, Bura, Mombassa, British East Africa, Farmer Nov 16
 Roote & Co, Manchester
 TAYLOR, GEORGE SMITH, Stanbury, Yorks, JP Nov 24 Spencer & Co, Keighley
 WELSHOP, JESSIE MAUDE, Burton rd, Brixton Nov 19 Fowler & Co, Bedford row
 WHARTON, SARAH, Rochdale Nov 17 Clegg, Rochdale
 WHITAKER, LOUISA, Burnley Nov 1 Holmes & Holmes, Burnley
 WORLEY, CHARLES HENRY, Welbeck st, Cavendish sq, Architect Dec 31 Maffey &
 Brentnall, St Dunstan's hill

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Oct. 12.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, ALBERT ANDREW, Chivers Cotton, Nuneaton,
 Warwick, Undertaker Birmingham Pet Sept 24 Ord
 Oct 10
 BARNARD, WILLIAM, Godstone, Surrey, Timber Merchant
 Croydon Pet Sept 21 Ord Oct 9
 BENJAMIN, BENJAMIN, Randolph rd, Maid Vale, Tailor
 High Court Pet Sept 20 Ord Oct 8
 BLOOMAN, SAMUEL, Commercial rd, Woolton Merchant
 High Court Pet Aug 31 Ord Oct 9
 BURNES, HENRY, Oct 3, Ealing, Builder Brentford Pet
 Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 CHIVERS, A. W., Heaton rd, Rye in, Peckham High Court
 Pet Aug 22 Ord Oct 8
 DIXON, PAUL, Burnley, Grocer Burnley Pet Oct 10 Ord
 Oct 10
 ENNETT, GEORGE ALBERT, and THOMAS ENNETT, Shipley,
 Yorks Bradford Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 FLEET, CHARLES, and GEORGE ALBERT JAMES FLEET, Mar-
 gale, House Decorators Canterbury Pet Oct 9 Ord
 Oct 9
 FORD, GEORGE, Birmingham, Glider Birmingham Pet
 Sept 20 Ord Oct 9
 FRASER, JAMES CHRISTOPHER, Yarm on Tees, Yorks, Com-
 mercial Clerk Stockton on Tees Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
 GOWLING, GEORGE, Whalley Range, Manchester, Plumber
 Manchester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 HARRISON, ALEXANDER THURMAN, Richmond, Yorks, Shep-
 herd Northallerton Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 HERNIMAN, HENRY WATERMAN, Uphill, Somerset, Butcher
 Bridgwater Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 HILL, ALFRED HARRISON, New Basford, Nottingham, Baker
 Nottingham Ord Oct 9 Pet Oct 9
 HOLDEN, EDWIN, Halifax, Designer Halifax Pet Oct 8
 Ord Oct 8
 JAMES, THOMAS, Stepney, Whitesmith High Court Pet
 Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 JOHNSTONE, HENRY WILLIAM, and WILLIAM MATTHEW
 JOHNSTONE, Tyngs st, Clerkenwell, Makers of Surgical
 Appliances High Court Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 JONES, DAVID GRIFFITH, Pendre, Cardigan, Draper Car-
 marthen Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 JONES, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Fenton, Staffs, Agent Stoke
 upon Trent Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 JONES, WALTER HENRY, Coventry, Fruiterer Coventry
 Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 LAWRENCE, ALBERT HENDRICK, St John st, Smithfield,
 Fender Maker High Court Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 LEGGOTT, GEORGE HENRY, Beeston cum Mileham, Norfolk,
 Farmer Norwich Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 MAY, ELLIS CLARA, Chessilton rd, Fulham High Court
 Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 MORRISON, M. CHRIS st, Poplar, Provision Dealer High
 Court Pet Aug 29 Ord Oct 10
 NEWSOME, HECTOR, Swindon, Newsagent Swindon Pet
 Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 OWEN, LEONARD SKULL, Swansea, Builder Swansea Pet
 Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 PEARCE, ALBERT, Batley, Yorks, Coach Builder Dewsbury
 Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 POTTER, ZACHARIUS, Derby Derby Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 POWELL, WILLIAM JOHN, Staple Hill, Bristol, Baker
 Bristol Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 RAYSON, HENRY, Downham Market, Norfolk, Cycle
 Dealer King's Lynn Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 9
 RAY, LUDWIG, Bartlett's bldgs, General Merchant High
 Court Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 10
 SHUKER, WILLIAM J., Halesowen, Worcester, Fruiterer
 Shourbridge Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 SQUIRRE, WILLIAM, Farnal, Yorks, Architect York Pet
 Sept 18 Ord Oct 8
 STEARNS, JOSEPH, Newcastle upon Tyne, Potato Merchant
 Hanley Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 STUBBS, WILLIAM, and ROBERT STUBBS, Blyth Bridge,
 Longton, Staffs, China Manufacturers Stoke upon
 Trent Pet Sept 15 Ord Oct 8

SWIFT, SIDNEY, Kingston upon Hull, Fishmonger King-ton
 upon Hull Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 TAYLOR, WILLIAM HENRY, Croydon, Wine Merchant
 Croydon Pet Sept 14 Ord Oct 9
 THOMAS, RUTH, Vauxhall Bridge rd, Westminster High
 Court Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 THOMPSON, THOMAS WILLIAM, Woodville, Derby, Brewer
 Burton on Trent Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 WALKER, FREDERICK HENRY, Darlington, Saddler Stockton
 on Tees Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 WHEELER, EDWARD, Worcester, Grocer Worcester Pet
 Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 WHITE, JAMES NATHANIEL, Welling, Bexley Heath, Kent
 Builder Rochester Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 WHITEHOUSE, FREDERICK, Ipswich, Builder Ipswich Pet
 Aug 31 Ord Oct 9
 WILLIAM, TAYLOR & Co, Tamworth, Staffs, Builders
 Birmingham Pet Aug 27 Ord Oct 9
 WILLIAMS, ANNE M., Cardiff, Fruit Merchant Cardiff Pet
 Sept 25 Ord Oct 9
 WINFIELD, FREDERICK CHARLES, Stoke Ferry, Norfolk,
 Corn Merchant King's Lynn Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 9
 WRIGHT, ROBERT LOFTUS, Liverpool, Public House Manager
 Liverpool Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8

FIRST MEETINGS.

BENJAMIN, BENJAMIN, Randolph rd, Maid Vale, Tailor
 Oct 22 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 BLOOMAN, SAMUEL, Commercial rd, Woolton Merchant Oct
 23 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 BRADBURY, ARTHUR, Walsall, Draper Oct 23 at 11 30 Off
 Rec, Wolverhampton
 CHIVERS, A. W., Heaton rd, Rye in, Peckham Oct 22 at
 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 EARL, FREDERICK, Derby, Baker Oct 20 at 11 Off Rec, 47,
 Full st, Derby
 ENNETT, GEORGE ALBERT, and THOMAS ENNETT, Shipley,
 Yorks Oct 23 at 3 Off Rec, 29, Tyne st, Bradford
 EVANS, ROBERT, Corven, Merioneth, Farmer Oct 22 at 12
 The Priory, Wrexham
 GANBRILL, THOMAS HENRY, Petham, Kent, Implement
 Agent Oct 25 at 3 15 Off Rec, 36a, Castle st, Canter-
 bury
 HARRISON, ALEXANDER THURMAN, Downholve Park, nr
 Richmond, Yorks, Shepherd Oct 22 at 11 30 Court
 house, Northallerton
 HARRISON, FRANCIS WILFRED, Preston, Tailor Oct 23 at 11
 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 HOLDEN, EDWIN, Halifax, Designer Oct 24 at 3 Off Rec,
 Townhall chambers, Halifax
 HOPKINS, JAMES RANDOLPH INNES, Darlington Oct 26 at
 12 30 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 HUDSON, RUTH, Colne, Lancs, Coal Agent Oct 26 at 11 30
 Church Institute, Manchester rd, Burnley
 LOWE, RICHARD, Tettenhall, Staffs, Nurseryman Oct 23 at
 12 Off Rec, Wolverhampton
 MORTON, WILLIAM CHRISTOPHER, Thornborough, Bucks,
 Farmer Oct 23 at 12 1, St Aldates, Oxford
 FORB, WILLIAM, Jun, Romford, Essex, Cattle Dealer Nov
 7 at 3 Shirehall, Chelmsford
 REES, THOMAS HENRY, Talbach, Glam, Blacksmith's
 Striker Oct 23 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd,
 Swansea
 STUBBS, WILLIAM, and ROBERT STUBBS, Longton, Staffs,
 China Manufacturers Oct 22 at 11 30 Off Rec, King
 st, Newcastle, Staffs
 SWANWELL, HAROLD HENRY, Newport, Mon, Auctioneer
 Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, 144, Commercial st, Newport,
 Mon
 SWIFT, SIDNEY, Kingston upon Hull, Fishmonger Oct 29
 at 11 Off Rec, Trinity House in Hull
 THOMAS, ANNA, Pembroke Dock, Milliner Oct 20 at 12 30
 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
 THOMAS, RUTH, Vauxhall Bridge rd Oct 22 at 12 Bank-
 ruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 THOMPSON, THOMAS WILLIAM, Woodville, Derby, Brewer
 Oct 19 at 2 15 Off Rec, 47, Full st, Derby
 TOOLEY, HENRY, Calne, Wilts, Coal Merchant Oct 22 at 11
 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon
 WAINWRIGHT, SAMUEL JOHN, Preston, Lancs, General House
 Furnisher Oct 23 at 11 30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st,
 Preston

WESTON, WILLIAM, Warwick, Cowman Oct 22 at 3 Off
 Rec, 8, High st, Coventry
 WHEATLEY, JOHN GEORGE, Houghton le Spring, Durham,
 Confectioner Oct 24 at 3 Off Rec, 3, Manor pl,
 Sunderland
 WHEELER, EDWARD, Worcester, Grocer Oct 22 at 11 30
 45, Copenhagen st, Worcester
 WHITE, JAMES NATHANIEL, Welling, Bexley Heath, Kent,
 Builder Oct 22 at 11 15, High st, Rochester
 WILKETT, JOHN, Tilton, nr Malpas, Chester, Grocer Oct
 22 at 12 Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
 WILLIS, HENRY, Upper Kennington in, Steam Turner Oct
 22 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

ANTILL, EDWIN, Lewisham, Builder High Court Pet Aug
 31 Ord Oct 9
 BRATON, GEORGE, Backland, Portsmouth, Storeman
 Portsmouth Pet July 14 Ord Oct 9
 BURGESS, HENRY, Oak st, Ealing, Builder Brentford Pet
 Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 DIXON, PAUL, Burnley, Weaver Burnley Pet Oct 10 Ord
 Oct 10
 DOOGETT, ERNEST EDWARD, Fulham, Builder High Court
 Pet Aug 23 Ord Oct 9
 ENNETT, GEORGE ALBERT, and THOMAS ENNETT, Shipley
 Yorks Bradford Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 FLEET, CHARLES, and GEORGE ALBERT JAMES FLEET, Mar-
 gale, House Decorators Canterbury Pet Oct 9 Ord
 Oct 9
 FRASER, JAMES CHRISTOPHER, Yarm on Tees, Yorks, Com-
 mercial Clerk Stockton on Tees Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 6
 GANBRILL, THOMAS HENRY, Petham, Kent, Implement
 Agent Canterbury Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 9
 GOWLING, GEORGE, Whalley Range, Manchester, Plumber
 Manchester Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 HARRISON, ALEXANDER THURMAN, Downholve Park, nr
 Richmond, Yorks, Shepherd Oct 22 at 11 30 Court
 house, Northallerton
 HERNIMAN, HENRY WATERMAN, Uphill, Somerset, Butcher
 Bridgwater Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 HILL, ALFRED HARRISON, New Basford, Nottingham, Baker
 Nottingham Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 HOLDEN, EDWIN, Halifax, Designer Halifax Pet Oct 8
 Ord Oct 8
 HOPKINS, JAMES RANDOLPH INNES, Darlington Stockton on
 Tees Pet Oct 1 Ord Oct 10
 HUNTER, WILLIAM, West Hartlepool, Plumber Sunderland
 Pet Sept 11 Ord Oct 8
 JAMES, THOMAS, Jamaica st, Stepney, Whitesmith High
 Court Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 JOHNSTONE, HENRY WILLIAM, and WILLIAM MATTHEW
 JOHNSTONE, Tyngs st, Clerkenwell, Makers of Surgical
 Appliances High Court Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 JONES, DAVID GRIFFITH, Pendre, Cardigan, Draper and
 Outfitter Carmarthen Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 JONES, FREDERICK JOSEPH, Fenton, Staffs, Agent Stoke
 upon Trent Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 JONES, WALTER HENRY, Coventry, Fruiterer Coventry
 Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 LEGGOTT, GEORGE HENRY, Beeston cum Mileham, Norfolk,
 Farmer Norwich Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 MARTINEAU, WALTER, Wolverhampton, Engineer Wolver-
 hampton Pet June 2 Ord Oct 8
 MAY, ELLIS CLARA, Chessilton rd, Fulham High Court
 Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 NEWSOME, HECTOR, Swindon, Newsagent Swindon Pet
 Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 OWEN, LEONARD SKULL, Swansea, Builder Swansea Pet
 Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 PEARCE, ALBERT, Batley, Coach Builder Dewsbury Pet
 Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 POTTER, ZACHARIUS, Derby Derby Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 REED, CHARLES LEONARD, Woburn sq, Jeweller High
 Court Pet Sept 28 Ord Oct 8
 SAUNDERS, WILLIAM, Jun, Halesowen, Worcester, Fruiterer
 Shourbridge Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 STEARNS, JOSEPH, Newcastle upon Tyne, Staffs, Potato
 Merchant Hanley Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 STUBBS, WILLIAM, and ROBERT STUBBS, Blyth Bridge,
 Longton, Staffs, China Manufacturers Stoke upon
 Trent Pet Sept 15 Ord Oct 10

SWIFT, SIDNEY, Kingston upon Hull, Fishmonger Kingston upon Hull Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 TAYLOR, ALFRED ISAAC, Bristol, Furniture Remover Bristol Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 8
 THOMAS, ANNA, Pembroke Dock, Pembroke, Milliner Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 8
 THOMAS, RUTH, Vauxhall Bridge rd, Lodging House Keeper High Court Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 THOMPSON, THOMAS WILLIAM, Woodville, Derby, Brewer Burton on Trent Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 WALKER, FREDERICK HENRY, Darlington, Saddler Stockton on Tees Pet Oct 10 Ord Oct 10
 WHEELER, EDWARD, Worcester, Grocer Worcester Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 WHITE, JAMES NATHANIEL, Welling, Berley Heath, Kent, Builder Rochester Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 9
 WHITTON, JOHN THOMAS, Tavistock, Devon, Engineer Plymouth Pet Aug 10 Ord Oct 6
 WILTON, MAURICE JOHNSON BURT, Paddington, Butcher's Manager Kingston, Surrey Pet Oct 4 Ord Oct 9
 WRIGHT, ROBERT LOTUS, Liverpool, Public House Manager Liverpool Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 8
 Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Oct 5:
 ALLEN, FREDERICK THOMAS, Tredegar, Mon, Colliery Timberman Tredegar Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 3
 London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Oct. 16.

RECEIVING ORDERS.
 ALLEN, HENRY FRANCIS, Portsmouth, Watchmaker Bristol Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 BAKER, WILLIAM, Shipston on Stour, Worcester, Monumental Sculptor Banbury Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 BIRD, EDWARD, Moor, Sheffield, Hosiery Sheffield Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 BRADSHAW, WILLIAM, Southend on Sea Chelmsford Pet Sept 4 Ord Oct 10
 CARTMELL, WILLIAM, Brynning with Kellamerg, Lanca, Innkeeper Preston Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 CHADFIELD, PHILIP BROOKES, Friar Gate, Derby Derby Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 13
 COX, HARRY OFFER, Wakefield, Monumental Mason Wakefield Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 DICKER, HENRY, Barking, Essex, Baker Chelmsford Pet Sept 7 Ord Oct 10
 DINGLE, CHARLES, Plymouth, Butcher Plymouth Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 13
 DORE, EDWARD, Park walk, Chelsea, Coachbuilder High Court Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 DOUSE, THOMAS RALPH, Victoria st, Westminster High Court Pet Sept 4 Ord Oct 12
 EDWARDS, MORRIS, Iorwerth, Finsordale, Mon, Builder Tredegar Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 FILLEY, FREDERICK SMITH, Bristol, Cycle Dealer Bristol Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 13
 GIBBY, JOHN, Nanthir, Blaengarw, Glam, Repairer Cardiff Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 HARLOW, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Builder Burton on Trent Pet Oct 8 Ord Oct 12
 HARRIS, BECKER & SONS, Seward st, Brushfield st, Mantle Manufacturers High Court Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 12
 HARRIS, WILLIAM W. TONYANDY, Glam, Saddler Pontypridd Pet Sept 24 Ord Oct 10
 HIRE, WILLIAM BENJAMIN, Pembroke Dock, Pembroke, Dairyman Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 HUGHES, JOSEPH, Conway, Carnarvon, Builder Bangor Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 JONES, JOHN MEREDITH, Wrexham, Denbigh, Oil Merchant Wrexham Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 LEE, JOSEPH, Shipley, Yorks, Mason Bradford Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 MASON, WILLIAM HALL, Wolverhampton, Grocer Wolverhampton Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 NELSON, ALICE, Southport, Milliner Liverpool Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 POTTER, HUGH DIXON, Carlisle, Brush Manufacturer Carlisle Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 ROBERTS, JOSEPH, Llanwrst, Denbigh, Timber Feller Portmadoc Pet Sept 6 Ord Oct 11
 SALIBA, SELIM MOSES JOHN, Talbot rd, Bayswater High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Oct 11
 SMITH, HIRAM, Stalybridge, Cheshire, Wholesale Green-grocer Ashton on Lyne Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 SPARKS, ALBERT GRIFITH, Horfield, Bristol, General Dealer Bristol Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 TETLOW, JULES THOMAS, Newport, Innkeeper's Assistant Newport, Mon Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 13
 VROON, HENDRICK, Bernard mans, Bernard st, Russell sq High Court Pet July 20 Ord Sept 20
 WATKINS, I PRESTWOOD, Downs Park rd, Hackney, Surgeon High Court Pet Aug 22 Ord Oct 11
 WILLIAMS, HENRY, New Tredegar, Mon, Outfitter Tredegar Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12

FIRST MEETINGS.
 CONLEY, LEWIS, Birmingham, Baker Oct 24 at 11 191, Corporation st, Birmingham

COX, HARRY OFFER, Wakefield, Monumental Mason Oct 25 at 11 Off Rec, 6, Bond ter, Wakefield
 CROSSLAND, JOHN, Willaston, nr Chester, Fruit Merchant Oct 25 at 11 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 DORE, EDWARD, Park walk, Chelsea, Coachbuilder Oct 25 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 DOUSE, THOMAS RALPH, Victoria st, Westminster Oct 25 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 FLEET, CHARLES, and GEORGE ALBERT JAMES FLEET, Margate, House Decorators Oct 25 at 9.30 Off Rec, 48A, Castle st, Canterbury
 FRASER, JAMES CHRISTOPHER, Yarm on Tees, Yorks, Commercial Clerk Oct 24 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 FREEMAN, HERBERT, Melkham, Wilts, Dairyman Oct 24 at 11.45 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 GOWLING, GEORGE, Whalley Range, Manchester, Plumber Oct 24 at 2.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 GREENALL, THOMAS, Penwortham, nr Preston, Hotel Keeper Oct 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston
 HARRIS, BECKER & SONS, Seward st, Brushfield st, Mantle Manufacturers Oct 26 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 HARRIS, WILLIAM WILLIAMS, TONYANDY, Glam, Saddler Oct 24 at 12 135, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
 HERNIMAN, HENRY WATERMAN, Uphill, Somerset, Butcher Oct 24 at 12 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 HEYS, JOHN ROBERT, and MICHAEL HEYS, Bacon, Lancs, Cycle Dealers Oct 26 at 11.15 Town Hall, Rochdale
 JAFFE, JULIUS MAXIMILIAN LEOPOLD, Nottingham, Commission Agent Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
 JAMES, THOMAS, Exmouth st, Stepney, White Smith Oct 24 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 JOHNSTON, HENRY WILLIAM, and WILLIAM MATTHEW JOHNSTON, Tysoe st, Clerkenwell, Makers of Surgical Appliances Oct 29 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 JONES, WALTER HENRY, Coventry, Fruiturer Oct 24 at 11 Off Rec, 8, High st, Coventry
 LAWRENCE, ALBERT HENDRICK, St John st, Smithfield, Fender Maker Oct 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 LEGGIST, GEORGE HENRY, Beeston cum Milham, Norfolk, Farmer Oct 27 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 LIVERSIDGE, THOMAS, Middlesbrough, Master Painter Oct 26 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesbrough
 MAY, ELLER CLARA, Chesilton rd, Fulham Oct 24 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MORRISON, M. CHRIS, St. Poplar, Provision Dealer Oct 25 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 NEWSOME, HECTOR, Swindon, Newsagent Oct 25 at 11 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon
 NUTTALL, JOHN, Nelson, Lancs, Weaver Oct 25 at 11.45 Church Institute, Manchester rd, Burnley
 OWEN, LEONARD SKULL, St Thomas, Swansea, Builder Oct 25 at 11.30 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 PEARCE, ALBERT, Biele, Yorks, Coach Builder Oct 24 at 10.30 Off Rec, Bank chambers, Corporation st, Dewsbury
 PHIPP, JOHN CHARLES, Morston Marsh, Glos, Corn Merchant Oct 25 at 12 Off Rec, 1, St Aldate st, Oxford
 POWELL, WILLIAM JOHN, Bristol, Baker Oct 24 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 RAUM, LUDWIG, Redstone rd, Hornsey, General Merchant Oct 24 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 RICHARD, TAYLOR GLASSBORO, Ravenhill, nr Swansea Oct 25 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
 SALIBA, SELIM MOSES JOHN, Talbot rd, Bayswater Oct 25 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 SPARKS, ALBERT GRIFITH, Horfield, Bristol, General Dealer Oct 24 at 12.15 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
 SQUIRES, WILLIAM, Pannal, Yorks, Architect Oct 25 at 3.30 Off Rec, Park row, Leeds
 VROON, HENDRICK, Bernard mans, Bernard st, Russell sq Oct 24 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 WATKINS, I PRESTWOOD, Downs Park rd, Hackney, Surgeon Oct 25 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 WILTON, MAURICE JOHNSON BURT, Teddington, Butcher's Manager Oct 24 at 12.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge

ADJUDICATIONS.
 ALLEN, HENRY FRANCIS, Clifton, Bristol, Watchmaker Bristol Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 BAKER, WILLIAM, Shipston on Stour, Worcester, Monumental Sculptor Banbury Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 12
 BARNARD, WILLIAM, Godstone, Surrey, Timber Merchant Croydon Pet Sept 21 Ord Oct 13
 BENJAMIN, BENJAMIN, Randolph rd, Maida Vale, Tailor High Court Pet Sept 20 Ord Oct 11
 BIRD, EDWARD, Moor, Sheffield, Hosiery Sheffield Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 BRATHWAITE, HARRY BROWNE, Chiswick Foot, nr Halifax, Government Contractor Halifax Pet Sept 27 Ord Oct 11
 BROWN, JOHN, Anfield, Liverpool, Timber Merchant Liverpool Pet Sept 10 Ord Oct 13

CARTMELL, WILLIAM, Brynning with Kellamerg, Lanca, Innkeeper Preston Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 CHIFFERALL, ALFRED WILLIAM, Catford High Court Pet Aug 22 Ord Oct 11
 CLIFTON, JOHN WILLIAM, Dean st, Soho, Shirt Maker High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Oct 11
 COX, HARRY OFFER, Wakefield, Monumental Mason Wakefield Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 DINGLE, CHARLES, Plymouth, Butcher Plymouth Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 DORE, EDWARD, Chelsea, Coach Builder High Court Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 DOWLS, ARTHUR, Camberly, Surrey, Auctioneer Guildford Pet Aug 17 Ord Oct 11
 EDWARDS, MORRIS, Iorwerth, Finsordale, Mon, Builder Tredegar Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 EVANS, ROBERT, Corwen, Merioneth, Farmer Wrexham Pet Sept 19 Ord Oct 9
 GIBBY, JOHN, Nanthir, Blaengarw, Glam, Repairer Cardiff Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 HARLOW, JOHN, Burton on Trent, Builder Burton on Trent Pet Oct 6 Ord Oct 12
 HARRIS, WILLIAM WILLIAMS, TONYANDY, Glam, Saddler Pontypridd Pet Sept 24 Ord Oct 12
 HARRISON, ALFRED WILLIAM, Bristol, Rope Manufacturer Bristol Pet June 29 Ord Oct 12
 HIRE, WILLIAM BENJAMIN, Water st, Pembroke Dock, Dairyman Pembroke Dock Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 HUGHES, JOSEPH, Conway, Carnarvon, Builder Bangor Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 JACKSON, ARTHUR, Godalming, Harness Maker Guildford Pet Aug 22 Ord Oct 11
 LAWRENCE, ALBERT HENDRICK, St John st, Smithfield, Fender Maker High Court Pet Oct 9 Ord Oct 13
 LEE, JOSEPH, Shipley, Yorks, Mason Bradford Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 LOCK, JOSEPH HUBERT MARVIN, Dorchester, Butcher's Assistant Dorchester Pet Sept 11 Ord Oct 11
 LONDON, SIDNEY A. Hendre, Bettws y Coed, N Wales High Court Pet Aug 15 Ord Oct 11
 MASON, WILLIAM HALL, Wolverhampton, Grocer Wolverhampton Pet Oct 13 Ord Oct 13
 NELSON, ALICE, Southport, Lancs, Milliner Liverpool Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 POTTER, HUGH DIXON, Newtown, Carlisle, Brush Manufacturer Carlisle Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 PHIPP, JOHN CHARLES, Morston in the Marsh, Glos, Corn Merchant Banbury Pet Sept 18 Ord Oct 12
 RAMSON, HERBERT, Downham Market, Norfolk, Cycle Dealer King's Lynn Pet Oct 5 Ord Oct 13
 ROBERTS, JOSEPH, Llanwrst, Denbigh, Timber Feller Portmadoc Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 SMITH, HIRAM, Stalybridge, Cheshire, Wholesale Green-grocer Ashton on Lyne Pet Oct 11 Ord Oct 11
 SQUIRES, WILLIAM, Pannal, Yorks, Architect York Pet Sept 18 Ord Oct 10
 WADE, WILLIAM, Crews, Builder Crews Pet Sept 17 Ord Oct 12
 WILLIAMS, HENRY, New Tredegar, Mon, Outfitter Tredegar Pet Oct 12 Ord Oct 12
 WILLIS, HENRY, Upper Kennington ln, Steam Turner High Court Pet Oct 3 Ord Oct 12
 YARBELL, ALBERT WILLIAM THOMAS, Granville rd, N Finchley High Court Pet Sept 7 Ord Oct 12

LAW.—GREAT SAVING.—For prompt payment 25 per cent. will be taken off the following writing charges:—

Abstracts Copied	...	s. d.
Briefs and Drafts	...	0 8 per sheet.
Deeds Bound Hand	...	2 3 per 30 folios.
Deeds Abstracted	...	0 2 per folio.
Full Copies	...	2 0 per sheet.

PAPER.—Foolscap, 12. per sheet; Draft, 4d. ditto; Parchment, 1s. 6d. to 3s. 6d. per skin.

KERR & LANHAM, 16, Fumival-street, Holborn, E.C.

LAW BOOKS at GREAT REDUCTIONS!!
 —All kinds of Law, Commercial, and other Books supplied. Mostly LATEST EDITIONS. State want. Send for List. New Books at 20 per cent. Discount. Sent on approval. BOOKS BOUGHT.—W. & G. FOYLE, 118, Charing Cross-road, W.C.

BAILIFF'S OFFICE, 21, Penton-place, London, W.C.—RENTS COLLECTED and RECOVERED; AUCTION SALES conducted. Solicitors and Railway References.

TO M.P.s, BARRISTERS, and Others.—Office Accommodation, with or without Clerical Assistance, close to House of Commons.—CAUSA, Palace-chambers, Westminster, S.W.

BUILDING DISPUTES arising out of Plans, specifications, Quantities, or actual Work. ASSISTANCE GIVEN IN, by a Gentleman of thirty-five years' experience.—Address EXPERT, 47, Devonport-road, Shepherd's Bush, London, W.

GRAY'S INN (opposite).—Three Ground-floor Offices To Let. Spacious; well-lighted; rent, £150 inclusive; second floor £75. Also City Offices at low rents.—J. ALLEN, 34, New Bridge-street, E.C.

CHANCERY LANE.—Capital Offices to be Let in modern buildings, fitted with passenger lifts.—Apply to Messrs. JONES, LANG, & Co., 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

MADAME TUSSAUD'S EXHIBITION.—REALISTIC TABLEAU. THE BURNING OF HOME. Mr. Beerbohm Tree in the character of Queen Victoria. Portrait Model of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Open 9 till 10.

THE AUSTINIAN THEORY OF LAW.

Being an Edition of Lectures I., V., and VI. of Austin's "Jurisprudence," and of Austin's "Essay on the Uses of the Study of Jurisprudence." With Critical Notes and Excursus by W. JETHRO BROWN, LL.D., of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, Professor of Comparative Law in the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, and Author of "The Study of the Law," "The New Democracy," &c. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

[Just out.]

ACT OF STATE IN ENGLISH LAW.

By W. HARRISON MOORE, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law, formerly Scholar of King's College, Cambridge, Dean of the Faculty of Law in the University of Melbourne, Author of "The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia." Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

[Just out.]

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.